

The History Teacher's Magazine

EDITED UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF A COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION.

Volume VI.
Number 1.

PHILADELPHIA, JANUARY, 1915.

\$2.00 a year.
20 cents a copy.

CONTENTS

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| The Founding of the Roman Principate and Its Development into a Monarchy, by Prof. W. S. Ferguson - - - - - | 3 |
| The War and the Future of Civilization, by Roland G. Usher - - - | 13 |
| Early Methods in the Teaching of History in Secondary Schools, I, by Prof. W. F. Russell - - - - - | 14 |
| Louisiana High School Rally Day - - - - - | 19 |
| Value, Content and Method in Mediaeval History, by Prof. J. W. Thompson | 20 |
| Reports from the Historical Field, edited by Walter H. Cushing - - - | 23 |
| Periodical Literature, edited by Dr. Mary W. Williams - - - - - | 24 |
| Book Reviews, edited by Prof. W. J. Chase - - - - - | 25 |
| Recent Historical Publications - - - - - | 27 |

Published monthly, except July and August, by McKinley Publishing Co., Philadelphia, Pa.
Copyright, 1915, McKinley Publishing Co. Entered as second-class matter, Oct. 26, 1909, at Post-office at Phila., Pa., under Act of March 3, 1879

A Course which sets a New Standard

Outlines of European History

ROBINSON-BREASTED-BEARD

The two volumes which make up the *Outlines of European History* have been prepared to meet the need expressed in the Report of the Committee of Five urging a two-year course in general history for high schools. In placing emphasis throughout on the conditions and institutions most essential to an understanding of subsequent history, rather than on unrelated events, these books are in full accord with the new spirit in the teaching of history. Moreover, the authors' reputation for sound scholarship is international, and a guaranty of the entire fitness of these texts for class use.

Part I, by James Harvey Robinson, Columbia University, and James Henry Breasted, the University of Chicago, covers Oriental, classical, and mediæval history to the beginning of the eighteenth century, and includes a wealth of original illustrative material—notably several "pen etchings"—of immense value to a proper understanding of the text. 730 pages, illustrated, \$1.50.

Part II, by James Harvey Robinson and Charles A. Beard, Columbia University, covers European history from the eighteenth century to the present time, with emphasis on those movements and policies that have a direct, present-day significance. 553 pages, illustrated, \$1.50.

GINN AND COMPANY, Publishers

| | | | |
|---------|----------|----------|---------------|
| Boston | New York | Chicago | London |
| Atlanta | Dallas | Columbus | San Francisco |

"The Best Introductory Treatise in the English Language."

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY,

December 1, 1914.

GARNER'S POLITICAL SCIENCE is unquestionably the best introductory treatise in the English language, and is excelled only by few of the more advanced treatises on the subject. One especially pleasing characteristic is the author's wide acquaintance with the European literature on the subject. I was particularly interested in the chapter on the Origin of the State. I have gone over that ground in great detail myself and was glad to note that our views are substantially the same and that Prof. Garner had noted all the main stages in the development of the theory. On the other parts of the book I can speak with less authority, but it seems uniformly good throughout.

HARRY E. BARNES,

Instructor, Department of Sociology.

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

Publishers

| | | |
|----------|------------|---------|
| New York | Cincinnati | Chicago |
|----------|------------|---------|

MACMILLAN BOOKS

For Various History Courses

ANCIENT HISTORY

Botsford: A History of the Ancient World \$1.50
A scholarly treatment of the history of the Orient, Greece and Rome.

Ashley: Ancient Civilization In Press
A briefer course which gives particular emphasis to social and industrial development.

AMERICAN HISTORY

Channing: Student's History of the United States \$1.40
In the latest revision of this popular book, the period since the Civil War has been especially emphasized.

Ashley: American History \$1.40
Recently revised to date. Social and economic contributions to national development are given particular attention.

Moore: Industrial History of the American People \$1.25
The industries and economic conditions affecting their growth are given a simple presentation in this text.

CIVICS

Ashley: American Government \$1.00
The practical work of the government—state, local, and national.

Beard: American Citizenship \$1.00
Treats government as a co-operative instrument in the hands of every citizen.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

64-66 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK CITY

| | | | | |
|--------|---------|---------|---------------|--------|
| Boston | Chicago | Atlanta | San Francisco | Dallas |
|--------|---------|---------|---------------|--------|

Indispensable for Every History Teacher and Student

THE NEW MAP OF EUROPE

By Herbert Adams Gibbons, Ph.D.,

Professor of History at Robert College, Constantinople. Author of "The Foundation of the Ottoman Empire."

Dr. Gibbons has been for years in close touch with the affairs of which he writes, and he has condensed the political history of Europe for the past ten years into this volume—showing the exact bearing of each crisis and incident from the Kaiser's famous visit to Morocco in 1905 up to the outbreak of hostilities in August, 1914.

It is vivid, personal, modern history, written with all the force and vivacity of powerful fiction.

Six maps. 8vo, 412 pages. At all booksellers
\$2.00 net, postage 10 cents.

THE CENTURY CO., Publishers

The History Teacher's Magazine

Volume VI.
Number 1.

PHILADELPHIA, JANUARY, 1915.

\$2.00 a year.
20 cents a copy.

The Founding of the Principate and its Development into a Monarchy

BY PROFESSOR WILLIAM S. FERGUSON, HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

The Teaching of Roman History. V.

A.

The fundamental work on this whole subject is Mommsen's "Römisches Staatsrecht," II, 2, 3d edition, 1887, pp. 743 ff. It has not been translated into English. It appears in French under the title, "Le droit public romain," Vol. 5, 1896. Its ideas are taken into account in every section of this article.

The old constitution of Rome, when strengthened and modified by an organic union between the senate and the first citizen of the republic, we call the principate. It was at once a new kind of government and the creator of a new administrative system—in both of which aspects it must be considered in this article.

Brought into being by Augustus in 27 B. C., the principate was changed profoundly by him four years later. Thereafter, during his lifetime, it was subjected to many minor alterations before being transmitted at his death (14 A. D.) to the scrupulous care of Tiberius, his personal as well as his political heir. In theory, this curious compromise between aristocracy and monarchy for the government of the republic continued to exist till the reign of Diocletian, when the monarch ceased to rule in virtue of a senatorial mandate and a popular election, and came to derive his authority simply from a nomination by his predecessor or a tumultuous acclamation by the army.

Therewith the republican substructure was withdrawn definitely from the government. Long since the partnership formed by Augustus between the senate and the prince had been dissolved. By a series of apparently disconnected actions, the prince had squeezed first the senate as a corporation, and then its members individually, out of the business of government, so that the last real *senatus consultum* was passed in the reign of Septimus Severus (193-211 A. D.); and in the reign of Gallienus (253-268 A. D.), the senators, to whom Augustus had reserved all high offices, were excluded specifically from the military administration of the state, and were set apart in the empire simply through the possession of fatal social and fiscal privileges. It is our purpose in this article to review this series of encroachments on aristocratic power; but we have also to notice, what is often confused with it, but is really something quite distinct, the corresponding series of steps by which the power of the prince was increased, first to

the benefit, later to the detriment, and ultimately to the destruction, of the cities or municipalities of which the empire was composed. For motivated, though it was, in a different set of causes, this triumph of central over local authority belongs properly to our theme, since every aggrandizement of the central government, being in fact a gain for the prince alone, disturbed the balance which Augustus had sought to create between the first citizen and the senate.

The theory of the principate, to resume, was abandoned only in Diocletian's time; the fundamental institutions of the principate were abandoned gradually in the preceding three hundred years. The principate itself, however, as a system of government in which the prince took orders from the senate and people of Rome in domestic or Italian affairs, and enjoyed full discretion of action only in the group of provinces assigned to him, existed only in the mind, or, at most, in the practice of its founder; for from the outset the prince was given rights and powers, not more considerable than the situation demanded, but so extensive that his will was supreme in all matters, even in those in which the decision was reached ostensibly by the senate and people alone. To show that this was the case—that from the very beginning the conditions of which Augustus had to take account were more monarchical than he was himself—is the first task to which we have to give attention.

B. THE FIGHT OF AUGUSTUS FOR VENGEANCE AND FOR ITALY.

Firth, "Augustus Cesar," 1903; Shuckburgh, "Augustus," 1903; Ferrero, "The Greatness and Decline of Rome," Vols. III, IV and V, 1908-9; Gardthausen, "Augustus und seine Zeit," 1891-1904; Domaszewski, "Geschichte der römischen Kaiser," 1st edition, 1909.

The conditions which Augustus faced in 27 B. C. were partly the results of a long historical development, and partly of his own creating. The long historical development which tended to evolve the monarchy in Rome has been traced in a preceding article. Hence we may confine ourselves here to a consideration of Augustus's own share in laying the foundations of the principate.

Nearly four years before he took the matter in hand, as a consequence of his victory at Actium (31 B. C.), he had brought under his jurisdiction the eastern provinces of the Roman empire and had con-

quered Egypt. In 36 B. C., to go back five years farther, after his victory over Sextus Pompeius at Messana, he had rounded out his territory in the west by the addition of Sicily and Africa to Spain and Gaul, which he possessed already. While as early as 42 B. C., after the defeat of Brutus and Cassius at Philippi, he had been the only one of the triumvirs—a board of dictators which had been invested by the senate and people in 43 B. C. with sovereign powers concurrent with their own—to take up residence and exercise authority in Italy; in Italy, that is to say, in the land of the Romans, for now the citizens of Rome occupied the whole peninsula south of the Alps; in Italy, that is to say, among the people which had conquered all the rest of the world that was subject to Augustus in 27 B. C. For fifteen years prior to the creation of the principate, Augustus had been at work in Italy transforming agrarian conditions, establishing its commercial independence, defending its coasts and its privileges; to ignore his own activity there when he came to reorganize the state would have been not simply unnatural, it would have been impossible.

Let us see of what this activity had consisted? Augustus was eighteen years old when Julius Caesar was assassinated (44 B. C.). Despite the entreaties of his guardian and his friends, he accepted the private legacy of his great uncle, in whose will he appeared as chief heir, and with it the political heritage inseparable from it. As yet he had no experience, either of politics or of war, and in the judgment of Cicero he was simply a lad to be praised, honored, and, when convenient, set aside. Yet within eighteen months he showed that he had the clearest head in Italy. The opportunity for political activity he found in the fact, ignored by Caesar's murderers, that there were in the peninsula hundreds of thousands of men who had given their loyalty to Julius Caesar, and owed their fortunes to him, and that of these a large number, sincerely desirous of avenging his death and suspicious of Mark Antony, Caesar's master of horse, who had compromised the murder, looked to Augustus as their natural head. With their support, and that of Cicero, who was quick to see the danger to the murderers of such a colleague, but who was vain enough to imagine that he could break the instrument once he had used it, Augustus forced Antony by his victory at Mutina to recognize the fact that the Cæsarians had not one leader but two. Associating with themselves Lepidus, master for the moment of seven legions, Augustus and Antony formed the so-called second triumvirate and wrested from the Romans electoral and legislative powers co-extensive with those of the comitia and administrative and deliberative powers equal to those of the senate. This done, Augustus outlawed the murderers of his "father," Antony and Lepidus, their private enemies, and all three, rich senators and knights from whose confiscated estates they filled their treasury. Thus striking terror into the hearts of the aristocracy, and assuring the peace in Italy, the two leaders of the Cæsarians followed up the "proscriptions" by rout-

ing Brutus and Cassius and their forces at Philippi, and dividing the Roman provinces between themselves and their colleague in the triumvirate. Therewith was accomplished the mission to which Augustus had thus far devoted his entire energies—the exacting of vengeance for the foul murder of Julius Caesar.

With his return to Italy in 42 B. C., a new chapter in his career was opened. His first act was to confiscate the lands of eighteen Italian cities, and settle on them the soldiers of Antony and himself whom he did not wish to keep on active service. Thenceforth the farmers of eighteen cities—all veterans—were bound to keep Augustus in power or risk their holdings. The disbanded army was no longer mobile, but it was more securely his. It had no longer any interest in Antony. His second step was to restore to Italy its control of the adjacent seas which it had lost to Sextus Pompeius, master of Sicily, as well as of three hundred ships. This was of vital importance to Rome, seeing that the food supply for its vast and turbulent population came mainly from abroad—from Sicily, Sardinia and Africa. Starvation for the multitude, riot for the government, humiliation for all patriots were at the disposal of Sextus Pompeius, until after four years of anxiety and effort Augustus possessed the stronger fleet and crushed the son of Caesar's rival at Messana. In this long war Augustus discovered his great general, Marcus Vipsanius Agrippa, who built and led the victorious fleet, and his great diplomat, Maecenas, who by skilful negotiations kept Antony from interfering while Augustus was in peril. The third step taken by Augustus was to restore to Italy its control over its Greek provinces, which, on his construction of events, it had lost to Antony when Antony, instead of ruling the east and settling scores with the Parthians as a Roman triumvir became the idle and licentious paramour of Cleopatra, queen of Egypt, subordinated his course of action to the policy of Egypt, and after distributing his provinces as future kingdoms for Cleopatra's children, threatened even to add Italy and the west to their joint realm. Once again Augustus presented himself to the Italians as their champion, and called upon them to hold their proud position as the masters of the world. All the citizens and municipalities in Italy and the west responded by taking an oath to follow him as their commander-in-chief in the war with Egypt that ensued. It was what the Romans called a *conjunctio*, we a conspiracy; and as the head of a conspiracy, to which all the Romans were privy, Augustus, by the instrumentality of the faithful Agrippa, won the battle of Actium over Antony, and conquered Egypt.

C. THE SETTLEMENT OF AUGUSTUS WITH IMPERIAL AND REPUBLICAN FEELING.

Kromayer, "Die rechtliche Begründung des Principats," 1888; Meyer, "Kaiser Augustus" in "Kleine Schriften," 1910, pp. 453 ff.; Gardthausen, *op. cit.*, above B, Vol. I, pp. 1334 ff.; Kolbe, "Der zweite Triumvirat" in "Hermes," 1914, pp. 273 ff. See also Ferrero, *op. cit.*, above B.

Foremost among the conditions created by the activity of these fifteen years, at the end of which Augustus, now rid of all rivals, gave himself undisturbed to the great problem of settling affairs definitely for the future, was the national feeling in Italy which he had conjured up. No solution could be satisfactory which did violence to it. Now this feeling was not only imperial—intolerant of any invasion of Roman privileges on the part of the subjects in the conquered provinces—but it was also republican. In this respect it had been violated often in the past, cynically by Sulla, thoughtlessly by Pompey, flagrantly and on principle by Julius Cæsar. But it had persisted despite all outrages. How strong it really was no one could perhaps say. Augustus, himself, estimated it highly. That is proved by his autobiography,¹ in which he tried to show that all his public actions were in strict accordance with republican practice and precedents. The powers of the triumvirate were legally conferred, but perhaps they could not be exercised legally by one alone of the triumvirs. Hence, between 42 and 32 B. C., while Antony was absent from Italy, it may have been necessary, as well as expedient, that while the consuls were really determined by Augustus and Antony, and the laws really initiated by one or both of them, the elections were held in the comitia, and legislation was there validated. The point has been argued by Mommsen and others that, though the term set to the triumvirate ended with the year 32 B. C., the triumvirs prolonged it automatically in virtue of the absolute power which they possessed, and that it was this office thus continued which Augustus resigned formally on January 13, 27 B. C., when, according to his own statement he transferred the republic from his own keeping to the hands of the senate and people of Rome—*rem publicam ex mea potestate in senatus populique Romani arbitrium transtuli*. But the conclusion is not admitted and probably is not admissible. For it seems reasonable that an authority to which a definite limit of years had been assigned should lapse on its expiry if it was not formally renewed; yet it is incredible that it could have been renewed at the mere volition of any one triumvir or in the circumstances that existed in 32 B. C. by agreement between Augustus and Antony. On the other hand, it has been argued more plausibly by Kromayer and others that the republic which was transferred to the senate and people in 27 B. C. had been consigned to the safekeeping of Augustus by the military oath of obedience to him taken by all the citizens in 31 B. C., when on ceasing through the lapse of triumviral power to be the head of the state he became the head of a universal conspiracy—a conspiracy of which the universality is adduced in Augustus's apology for his life as proof of its legality. In either case, the position of Augustus between 32 B. C. and 27 B. C. was anomalous. If he was triumvir it depended upon his good-will alone that elec-

tions were held, consuls were elected (he, himself, among them every year,) and laws passed. If he was *imperator autocrator* he had power of life and death over every citizen, and was entitled to unquestioning obedience from senators and magistrates, as well as from all persons in private capacity. Hence it must be taken as evidence of his republicanism, or at least of his desire to conciliate republican feeling, that after his return from Egypt, during 29 and 28 B. C., he refused extraordinary honors tendered to him, and took the measures he deemed necessary for putting the soldiery back into civil occupations, ridding the senate of illegal and unworthy senators, and, in general, administering Rome, as consul and the equal of his colleague in the consulship, with whom, in accordance with old republican practice, he changed the fasces, emblematic of power, every month. Then in 27 B. C. the republic was restored.

For a brief moment the senate and people were free to dispose of it as they pleased. What they pleased, however, was this: to assign to him as consul for the year a province of extraordinary dimensions, including Hither Spain, Gaul, and Syria, all the districts, in fact, in which unsettled conditions or frontier position made the presence of an army desirable. The grant, moreover, was made for a term of ten years, and, as a matter of fact, it was renewed at five or ten year intervals to the end of his life.

D. THE ANTECEDENTS AND ESSENTIALS OF THE PRINCIPATE.

Pelham, "The Imperium of Augustus and His Successors," in "Essays," edited by Haverfield, 1911, pp. 60 ff.; Abbott, "Roman Political Institutions," 1901, pp. 266 ff.; Greenidge, "Roman Public Life," 1901, pp. 341 ff.; Willems, "Le droit public romain," 7th edition, 1910, pp. 375 ff.

An extraordinary command such as this the senate alone under the Sullan regime (81-70 B. C.) had had the power to create and fill. Thereafter, for a time at least, the people exercised the right of deciding when such a command was necessary, and the senate merely designated the person to whom it should be assigned. The idea of Sulla seems to have been that the senate should be able to meet a great military crisis by selecting the best general wherever he should be found, among the consuls or praetors, the proconsuls or proprætors, even among private citizens, and by giving him a free field and a free hand for a term ordinarily of five years.² The chief beneficiary of this system had been Pompey, for many years the first citizen of the republic, or, as Cicero calls him, the *princeps*. As a private citizen he had been sent against Sertorius in Spain, as an ex-consul he had commanded against the pirates and Mithradates, as sole consul in the year 52 B. C. he had been

¹ Translated with text and commentary by Fairley, "Pennsylvania Reprints," Vol. V, 1, and by Shuckburgh, *op. cit.*, above B, pp. 293 ff.

² Pelham, "Outline of Roman History," 4th edition, 1907, p. 238, n. 3, as against the view of Sulla's reform of the magistracies stated by Mommsen, "History of Rome," III, p. 442; cf. Arnold, *op. cit.*, below I, p. 50, n. 1. It is commonly claimed that the appointment of a private citizen was illegal. Heitland, "The Roman Republic," 1909, Vol. III, p. 7.

at the same time governor of the two Spains, which he administered by means of two deputies (*legati*) of his own choosing, and commissioner of the corn supply of the capital with fifteen deputies to execute his orders and authority over the entire Mediterranean and its coasts for thirty miles inland.

To this idea the senate and people seem to have reverted in 27 B. C. To Augustus, as already stated, they assigned Spain, Gaul, and Syria, and authorized him to select for the government of the several provinces deputies with praetorian authority (*legati pro praetore*). Of all the soldiers given to the *legati* Augustus was commander-in-chief and it was he and not they to whom the men swore obedience, and to him alone the *legati* themselves were responsible. The essential difference between the new regime and any that had existed previously was that in the entire Roman world there were thenceforth no other generals in command of armies, and no soldiers, except those who gave their loyalty to Augustus, and took their orders from him. Possessed of this irresistible backing, Augustus was consul for year after year between 27 and 23 B. C. in a very different sense from his colleague on each occasion. As such, his imperium, nominally equal to that of his colleague, was in fact infinitely superior, while it was both actually and nominally superior to that of the praetors who administered justice in Rome, and to that of the proconsuls who governed the provinces not assigned to him, and left as of old under the supervision of the senate. There was, in fact, no corner of the Roman world to which the authority of Augustus could not and did not reach. Yet it was officially proclaimed that the republic was restored, and the senate, purged and strengthened, re-established in its ancient prerogatives. To bring the facts into better accord with the theory, Augustus threw up the consulship in 23 B. C., and refused to accept it thereafter. But at the same time and shortly afterwards, that the world might not be divided into two halves, the civil half, including Rome, Italy and the senatorial provinces, into which he dared not enter, and the military half in which he had sole jurisdiction; that is to say, that the world might not again be divided between the senate and the commander-in-chief of its forces, as it had been divided with resultant civil war during the latter years of Julius Caesar's proconsulship in Gaul, Augustus was empowered by special enactment of the senate and people to enter the *pomerium* without surrendering his military imperium, to convoke the senate and place the first proposal before it, and to rank on ceremonial occasions as the equal in respect of insignia and fasces of the two consuls duly elected. His imperium, for which a definition was necessary now that he had ceased to be consul, was defined as superior to that of the proconsuls in the senatorial provinces. In other words, though later on, in popular parlance, it was described, with reference to the domain in which it was exercised, as proconsular, it was in reality consular.²

² Pelham, in his "Essays," pp. 60 ff., had established this point against Mommsen. "Staatsrecht," II, pp. 840 ff.

Accordingly, what Augustus gave away with the one hand in 23 B. C., when he resigned the consulship, he took back with the other; with this difference, however, that whereas prior to 23 B. C. he had the right to check when he willed his colleague in the consulship and coerce when he willed all the other magistrates who had power in Rome and Italy, after 23 B. C. he lacked this right. But the defect thus occasioned he remedied by another means. As early as 36 B. C. the inviolability of the tribunes had been conferred upon him for life, and with it probably the right of assistance (*ius auxilii*). Seven years later this grant was perhaps modified, in that the area of its activity was enlarged to include in addition to the city within the *pomerium* a circuit three miles wide without it. But until 23 B. C. the rights thus obtained had been passive or latent. Then Augustus energized, and, perhaps, extended them. Thereafter, he appears in possession of the *tribunicia potestas*; that is to say, the power not of the individual tribunes, who are on the contrary his inferiors, but of all the tribunes combined. In other words, he could not only veto their acts and those of the urban magistrates, but they could not veto his; so that he could exercise without restraint all the extraordinary powers of obstruction over the civil executive traditional in the tribunate, and could also convoke the comitia and lay bills before it as no tribune in the past had ever been free to do.

Therewith was completed what in Augustus's view seemed desirable, the defense of the senate against the two elements by which its authority had been assailed during the hundred years of revolution that preceded the battle of Actium—the urban mob headed by a rebellious tribune, and the provincial soldiery headed by a rebellious proconsul. The question now was, what was there to defend the senate against a protector armed with such formidable weapons?

E. THE THEORY OF THE PRINCIPATE.

Meyer, *op. cit.* above B; Heinen, "Zur Begründung des römischen Kaiserkultes," "Klio," 1911, pp. 129 ff.; Ferguson, "Greek Imperialism," 1913.

The classification of the government thus constituted, from the point of view of political theory, has given rise to much controversy. We call it the principate, and intimate thereby that it was *sui generis*. Augustus called it a republic, and incurred therefor the charge, endorsed by historians from Tacitus to Mommsen, of hypocrisy. The question of politics, in the Aristotelian sense of the term, has accordingly become contaminated with the question as to the sincerity of the founder. It was long customary to view Augustus's creation as a monarchy masquerading in republican clothes—as a remodelling on a deceptive pattern of Julius Caesar's despotism.

An out and out absolutism the principate certainly was not. For of this the external forms had been established long before Augustus's time in the Graeco-Roman world. They included certain insignia, which Augustus never used, and, above all, the worship of the autocrat as a god. This is not the place to discuss

the origin and character of deification of rulers. It was in substance a device by which, in a constitutional state, a man was elevated above the laws to which otherwise he would have been subject, for the infraction of which he would otherwise have deserved punishment—a device, grounded in irreligion, by means of which an autocrat obtained the right to issue orders to cities and individuals and they in turn incurred the obligation to obey them. On being accepted as a god—and every state chose its own gods; Rome had been introducing new gods from time immemorial—a man ceased to be a citizen, and in ancient thinking he could live in a state and cease to be a citizen of it, except by degradation, in no other way. Hence we secure a touchstone of the limits of Augustus's absolutism by observing to what extent he permitted people to worship him. He did not allow the Romans to number him among the gods of their state, or to accord to him divine worship, while from freedmen or emancipated slaves, whom he deprived of citizenship, such homage was required. On the other hand, he arranged that every province subject to Rome should recognize *Roma et Augustus* as its deities, erect a temple or altar in their honor, offer them sacrifices, and choose priests to minister to their cult. This requirement was not imposed upon all the provinces at once. In fact, in the Greek east Augustus had simply to recognize a worship which arose there spontaneously; for only by deifying Rome and its prince were the Greeks able to accept the commands which came from Rome without political abasement and loss of self-respect. In the north and west, however, the worship of *Roma et Augustus* was imposed as the barbarian districts were successively organized; upon the three provinces of Spain at unknown dates; upon the three provinces of Gallia Comata as a single whole in 12 B. C.; upon the Danubian provinces at about 2 B. C., and upon Germany in or about 9 A. D.⁴ The distinctions thus drawn tell a clear tale. The absolutism of Augustus was co-ordinate and co-extensive with that of the senate and people of Rome; it was valid only in the subject world. There, however, a division of authority, of provinces, and, later, of revenues was made between the commander-in-chief and the republic. In view of this fact, the principate has been designated correctly by Mommsen a dyarchy, or rule of two, only if we have regard simply to conditions outside of Italy; for among Romans, that is to say, Italians, Augustus was simply a citizen, the chief citizen to be sure (*princeps civitatis*), the senior senator (*princeps senatus*), the chief magistrate. To the Roman world, as a whole, he was simply Augustus—a name without definite significance, a title without office or powers, an intimation of rank that had no equal among men. As regards Italy, if Italy be imagined for purpose of argument as shorn of all its provinces, the principate was in fact the republic restored; and, indeed, if Italy had suddenly lost its dependencies the first citizen would probably have fallen back into a position

consistent with republicanism. In other words, the elevation of the *princeps civitatis* to despotic power was a sacrifice demanded by imperial necessities. The principate is simply one among many proofs that an ancient city-state was unfitted to govern an empire.

F. AUGUSTUS'S MAXIMS OF STATECRAFT.

Pelham, "The Domestic Policy of Augustus," in "Essays," pp. 89 ff.

By the definition of my subject, I am precluded from considering the way in which Augustus, acting in conjunction with the senate or an allotted committee of the senate, and in collaboration with Agrippa and Tiberius, for whom in turn he secured the right to share in his own extraordinary honors and burdens, dealt with situation after situation as it arose during the forty-one years of his long principate. The art of government must not be confused with the instruments of government, or statecraft with its maxims. But if ever there is an excuse for explaining a system by showing how it worked it is in this instance, not so much perhaps because teachers should dwell upon the fascinating study of this cautious and intelligent personality at work upon problems of vast moment rather than upon the tangled system of Roman public law, but because there never was a government in which the qualities needed for successful rule were determined so largely by those possessed by its founder. His symbol was the sphinx, his motto "hasten slowly." His tact was infinite, his power of self-effacement, despite a pride which in old age degenerated into vanity, was extraordinary. He was firm without being arrogant, conciliatory without being weak. Among the haughty Roman nobles he moved freely as if in the society of his equals, yet no one presumed to impose upon his familiarity. He kept others in their place without constantly rattling his sword in its scabbard. He forced himself to forget that he was the master of 300,000 soldiers, yet was careful that they should always remember it. Above all, he knew how to prevent political questions from becoming military questions—the officers from becoming rulers of the state.⁵ The tragedy of the principate was that his successors were commonly misfits; the first *princeps* alone was equal to the exacting duties of the office and superior to its manifold temptations. The institutions which he created presupposed a personality such as his own, and that was not easily found.

The maxims of statecraft formulated by Augustus as a result of his long experience may be inferred in part from his actions, and in part from his deathbed injunctions to his successor. They are statable in the following terms: (1) The prince shall be chosen by the senate and people with the concurrence of the army; but in order to prevent a disputed succession he shall be designated in advance by becoming the colleague of the ruling prince of whom he shall be the personal or private heir.⁶ (2) The senate must

⁴ Heinen, *op. cit.*, above E; cf. Ferguson, "Amer. Hist. Rev.," 1912-13, pp. 29 ff., and the literature there cited.

⁵ Suetonius, "Caesar Augustus," in "Lives of the Twelve Caesars," translated by Thompson-Forester, 1896.

⁶ For a different interpretation of this condition, see Westermann, "Amer. Hist. Rev.," 1911-12, pp. 1 ff.

be treated as the source of authority, its members as the social equals of the prince and his family. (3) The ancient order of society, with its sharp distinctions of class, privileges and responsibilities between senators, knights, plebeians, and freedmen, must be recognized and supported by the state. (4) Between citizens and non-citizens, between Romans and Rome's subjects the old line must continue to be drawn in respect of military service, taxation, land tenure, marriage, law, and justice; the old road to citizenship, somewhat lengthened and narrowed, however, must be left open for deserving slaves, and by the status of Latins the old half-way house must be kept up for deserving subjects. (5) The Roman power can endure only in so far as the Romans, high and low, remain true to the customs which they have inherited from their ancestors (*mos maiorum*); the state shall, therefore, be vigilant in upholding all established religious observances and in keeping out foreign cults; it shall have poets and all who are capable of influencing public sentiment sing the praises of the pious, frugal, agricultural life of olden times; it shall endeavor by encouraging marriage and the rearing of children to replenish the Roman stock, and make it equal in numbers and character for its high mission of ruling the world. (6) The ancient government of Rome shall be preserved intact, but the citizens assembled in Rome, being but a small fraction of the whole number, and by no means its most worthy part, shall cease to elect the Roman magistrates and to monopolize the right of reaching political decisions. (7) The magistrates and promagistrates of Rome shall be administrators only in their relations with Roman citizens; in other respects their duties shall be simply to supervise administration, which shall be left so far as possible to municipal authorities to be constituted as needed where they are lacking. On the other hand, such agencies as are necessary to make supervision efficient, or to put an end to gross misgovernment, shall be created from time to time. (8) Egypt in the east and Gallia Comata in the west⁷ shall be regarded as *praedia*, the one of the prince, the other of the Roman people, and shall be denied local autonomy. (9) Conscription shall be abandoned, and a standing army sufficient for defense maintained. Soldiers shall enlist for twenty years, and while on service shall be unable to contract marriages. They shall receive a living wage during service, and on honorable discharge shall receive a pension of land and money. None but Roman citizens shall be admitted to the Roman army, but subjects shall be admitted in nearly equal numbers to auxiliary forces. When citizens by birth do not volunteer in sufficient strength to fill the gaps in the legions, subjects may be accepted, but they must be naturalized before being enrolled. To insure the payment of pensions a special military treasury shall be established, and kept filled by the proceeds of a one per cent. tax on sales in Italy and of a five per cent. succession tax levied on Roman citizens. (10)

⁷ Hirschfeld, "Klio," 1908, pp. 464 ff.; Ferrero, *op. cit.*, above B, Vol. V, ch. 5; Reid, *op. cit.*, below J, pp. 177 ff.

The empire shall be kept within natural, defensible boundaries, namely, the Rhine and the Danube on the north, the Euphrates on the east, the Sahara on the south, and the Ocean on the west. (11) Peace within and without shall be maintained so far as possible.

G. RECENT COMMENTS ON THE POLICY OF AUGUSTUS.

Pelham, "The Early Roman Emperors," in "Essays," pp. 21 ff.

At the death of Augustus, says Tacitus, *apud prudentes vita eius varie entollebatur arguebaturque*. The judgments passed by recent historians upon his policy seem also curiously divergent. Domaszewski⁸ finds that "he was always conscious of the conditions imposed by reality, and, like Nature with her creations, discovered what branches in the structure of the Roman state, when tested subsequently by the long trial of empire, had the sap of life in them, and were capable of further growth, what withered and died. Consequently, a duration uncommon in human affairs was vouchsafed to his work, and his ideas dominated for centuries and perished only with his own people." On the other hand, Hirschfeld,⁹ quoted and endorsed by H. Stuart Jones,¹⁰ says of him: "Though fully recognizing his endeavors, we cannot acquit Augustus of having cherished aims impossible of attainment, and created a system incapable of permanence; for he seriously overrated the capacity of the two pillars of the constitution, the *princeps* and the senate. He had hoped for the salvation of the state from the harmonious co-operation of these two factors, and as the senate refused its aid and the emperors proved incapable of fulfilling their duties and respecting the limits laid down for the imperial power, the transformation of the constitutional principate into a naked military despotism was bound to follow." Divergent as these two verdicts seem, they are, however, rather complementary than contradictory; for Domaszewski has in mind mainly the social reforms of Augustus. Hirschfeld the political. When we regard his policy as a whole, we are bound to listen to the most catholic of ancient historians, Eduard Meyer, when he declares:¹¹ "The constitution which he gave to the empire continued in name, with many modifications in detail, for three hundred years; but its content became at once a very different thing from what its author planned, and the development of the empire ran ultimately in the courses which he wished to avoid and block. Thus we see in the case of Augustus's handiwork the conflict of individual and general tendencies which dominates all history; each of the two influenced and modified the other, and that precisely it is that makes the event historical; thereby it acquires its specific and peculiar character—its historical individuality." With this German generalization agrees in the main

⁸ *Op. cit.*, above B, Vol. I, p. 248.

⁹ *Op. cit.*, below J, p. 467.

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, below H, p. 41.

¹¹ *Op. cit.*, above C, p. 444.

the reasoned judgment of the distinguished English historian, Pelham¹² (who so often hits the nail on the head when dealing with Roman history), though he expresses it in different fashion: "It is often urged," he says, "that Augustus must have known that such attempts [to revive the republic] were doomed to failure. But though we may grant that he miscalculated, it does not follow that he did not believe in his scheme, or that in January 27 B. C. he had not reasons for doing so. As to one condition of its successful working, his own moderation and self-restraint, he was presumably confident; as to the other, it is by no means clear that he was bound to despair of the republic without further trial. The Roman community was not so corrupt or effete as the language of many historians would lead us to believe. Neither the remnant of the old nobility nor even the city populace were utterly rotten. As to the great body of Roman citizens, Augustus, himself Italian on his father's side, and knowing Italy well, may reasonably have argued that, although the civil wars and the prevailing insecurity of the last twenty years had rudely shaken the fabric of society and produced a temporary demoralization, yet there existed germs of vigorous life which required only the restoration of peace, confidence, and settled government to develop and expand. It was clearly to this Roman people, to the Italy of Virgil and Horace, that he looked. They had been alienated by the narrow exclusiveness which guided the policy of the later republic; they might now be invited to play their part in a wider Rome, not as the subjects, together with Greeks and barbarians, of a supreme despot, but as a self-governing imperial race. Nor was his confidence altogether misplaced; for, although little is said of it by ancient writers whose horizon was bounded by the walls of Rome, the century that followed the compromise of 27 B. C. witnessed a great outburst of vigor and a rapid diffusion of prosperity in Italy. In one respect, indeed, Augustus's hopes were falsified; the activities which he set free did not run in the channels which he marked out for them. Their efforts are seen in literature, in commerce and agriculture, and in municipal life; but they left untouched the ancient political institutions of the city-state of Rome, the primary assembly, the elective magistracies, and even the senate. Yet Augustus's ideal was no unworthy one. He will never exercise over the imaginations of men the influence of Julius, but he saved for posterity a Latin civilization, and postponed for two centuries the triumph of undisguised military despotism." With which conclusion, appending merely Arnold's dictum¹³ that "the unacknowledged character of the despotism which Augustus created was a more indisputable evil" than his failure to develop "the provincial councils" into "real parliaments," and to create "a regular and organized representation of the provinces in the central government," and Greenidge's affirmation¹⁴ that the possibility of elec-

tion by the legions created a rude standard of merit, and it is questionable whether any really incapable man ever sat on the Roman throne"—we return to the maxims of Augustus.

H. THE PRINCE AND THE SENATE.

Schiller, "Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit," Vols. I and II, 1883; Bury, "The Student's Roman Empire," 1893; Jones, Stuart, "The Roman Empire," 1908; Taylor, "The Change from Dyarchy to Monarchy," in "A Constitutional and Political History of Rome," 1899, pp. 475 ff.; Hirschfeld, "Rückblick," in *op. cit.*, below J, pp. 466 ff.

In terms of their observance or non-observance nearly the whole story of the principate may be told. The ones which concern us most narrowly, and by means of which we may pass to the second part of our theme—the development of principate into monarchy—are two, four, and seven in our enumeration. In regard to the second, we remark in the first place that some of the emperors, notably Caligula (37-41 A. D.), Nero (54-68 A. D.), Domitian (81-96 A. D.), and the first two Severi (193-217 A. D.), broke radically with the whole theory of the principate, and, reverting to the absolutistic precedent of Julius Caesar and anticipating the slow emergence of despotism, they neglected, humiliated, and debased the senate, and governed without its assistance. Such violent changes of procedure were apt to be followed by equally violent reactions, but they helped on the disruption of the principate. Of quite another seriousness, however, were diminutions of senatorial prerogatives made by princes whom in contradistinction with the rulers just mentioned we may call the constitutional princes; for in this case authority once lost was lost for good. Augustus himself set the example. By creating the military treasury (*aerarium militare*) he rendered the army and its commander more independent of senatorial finance. By the appointment of prefects to govern Rome he lessened the power of the senate's executive officers. Tiberius (14-37 A. D.), moreover, by deputing his authority to the praetorian prefect, Sejanus, rid himself of his constitutional responsibility to the senate, and placed the senate at the mercy of the nearest military official. Claudius (41-54 A. D.) diminished perceptibly the rôle of the senators in public administration, and enlarged enormously the activities of his private servants. He also opened the senate to Gauls. The Flavian princes (69-96 A. D.) changed the character of the senate by restocking it with provincials—with men destitute of republican traditions. Subsequently it no longer objected to the principate on principle. Trajan (98-117 A. D.) sent his comptrollers to cities in Italy and in senatorial and imperial provinces regardless of constitutional frontiers. Hadrian (117-138 A. D.) and Marcus Aurelius (161-180 A. D.) withdrew Italy from the senate's jurisdiction by the appointment of four *consulares (iuridici)* for the general administration of its four quarters. Claudius organized the Fiscus as a treasury for the revenues collected by the prince, and Vespasian and Hadrian reduced so considerably the sources of senatorial revenues that the step taken by Septimius Severus

¹² "Essays," pp. 31 ff.

¹³ *Op. cit.*, below I, p. 137.

¹⁴ *Op. cit.*, above D, p. 362.

when he made the *aerarium Saturni* simply the municipal treasury of Rome was not a long one. Hadrian practically eliminated the senators from the civil service, and admitted knights, whom he substituted for them, even to his privy council. By these successive losses, even before the epoch-making regime of the Severi, the senate became simply a spectator where once it had been a partner. But the whole empire had changed at the same time. At the establishment of the principate, the main cohesive force in the civilized world had been the Romans, and of them the senate was the head and the senators the hands. "When Hadrian assumed the command," says Pelham,¹⁵ "the old theory of the empire as a federation of distinct communities in alliance with and under the protectorate of Rome was rapidly losing ground. The differences in race and language, in habits of life, and modes of thought, which had formerly justified and even necessitated it, were fast disappearing. The titles and distinctions which had once implied not only a desire for political independence, but a partial possession of it were becoming mere phrases. Even the 'freedom' of a free community could be ridiculed with impunity by a popular orator, and the native state, with its native ruler, was, except in a few outlying corners of the empire, a thing of the past. The idea of a single Roman state was in the air, and Hadrian gave effect to it with singular skill and perseverance. His cosmopolitanism was in reality imperialism, and sprang from his desire to stamp everything with the imperial mark, and to utilize everything for the benefit of the empire. He was a Phil-Hellenist, not merely from sentiment, but from the conviction that Latins, Greeks, and even barbarians had all something to contribute to the common service. The man who appointed the Greek Arrian to the command of Roman legions and of a Roman frontier province was noted equally for his careful study of old Roman tactics, and for his liberal adoption of barbarian movements." In this cosmopolitan world the idea of national supremacy, for which the senate had stood and with which it fell, was an anachronism. The emperor alone was the incorporation of the people's ideal, the subject of such loyalty as existed, the only helper in time of need. In subsequent times the senators were agents of disruption.¹⁶

I. THE ITALIANS AND THEIR SUBJECTS.

Mommsen, "Provinces of the Roman Empire," 1899; Arnold, "Roman Provincial Administration," 2d edition, 1906. A third edition of this deservedly popular work has just appeared. Dill, "Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius," Books I and II, 1905; Reid, "The Municipalities of the Roman Empire," 1913; Friedländer, "Town Life in Ancient Italy," 1902; Haverfield, "Ancient Town-Planning," 1913; Seeck, *op. cit.*, below K, Vol. II, pp. 145 ff.; Declercq, "Quelques problèmes d'histoire des institutions municipales

au temps de l'Empire romain," in "Nouvelle Revue Historique de droit français et étranger," 1902, pp. 233, 437, 554; 1904, pp. 306, 474, 578; 1908, pp. 543, 674; 1909, pp. 466, 619; 1910, pp. 174 ff.

How this great change came about we may observe from the application of the maxim of Augustus which comes fourth in our enumeration. Its objects were twofold: to restrict the Romans to Italy in the interests of imperialism, and to preserve the provinces as tribute-paying districts. In the long run, however, neither proved feasible or desirable. Even before Augustus's time colonies of Roman citizens had been organized in the provinces, and he was himself obliged to organize others for his veterans, and for the Italians whom his veterans displaced. The natives of Italy simply could not be kept out of the fertile provincial lands, and they were not all willing to sacrifice their citizen privileges to secure them. Still, the Latin half-way houses, of which Augustus established many in the provinces, in which men, without being free from tribute, enjoyed the free use of Latin law, institutions, and language, proved sufficiently attractive to the majority, and they had the additional advantage to the government that they could be opened without fiscal sacrifice to the subjects according as they became fit and desirous to enter. These hostels proved, accordingly, to be the chief centres for the Latinization of western Europe. Moreover, as time went on, in consequence of a change which cannot be discussed here, the importance of the tribute among the revenues of Rome progressively diminished, until finally the treasury stood to gain by the substitution for it of the five per cent. succession tax incident to citizenship.¹⁷ A liberal naturalization policy could, therefore, be adopted, in place of the parsimony shown by Augustus in this matter. By manumission, the body of freedmen, and consequently the body of citizens, was enlarged at the expense of the slave population; and by the grant of Latin rights to subjects (*peregrini*) and of Italian rights to Latins, the citizen body was still further enlarged, this time at the expense of the provincials. The principate of Claudius represents one epoch in this process; that of Hadrian another; Caracala represents its termination. After his famous edict (212 A.D.) granting Roman citizenship to all subjects, except *dediticii*, whoever they may be,¹⁸ the distinctions once universal persisted only among new freedmen; the non-citizens were relatively a negligible quantity. Therewith was ended definitely the imperial position of Italy. Substantially it had been ended earlier. It had been openly flouted when Septimius Severus, himself an African, had subjected the peninsula to military authority, and had appeared in Rome with the title and axes of a proconsul. Long since the Italians had been relieved of service in the legions and given the privilege of serving only in the praetorian guard. By disbanding this select corps,

¹⁵ "Essays," p. 162.

¹⁶ Zulueta, "Oxford Studies in Social and Legal History," Vol. I, 2, 1908; Gelzer, "Studien zur byzantinischen Verwaltung Ägyptens," 1909, pp. 72 ff.; Wilcken, *op. cit.*, below K, Vol. I, 1, pp. 322 ff.

¹⁷ Seeck, *op. cit.*, below K, Vol. II, p. 252.

¹⁸ Girard, "Manuel élémentaire de droit romain," 5th edition, 1911, p. 117; Wilcken, *op. cit.*, below K, Vol. I, 1, pp. 55 ff.

Severus effaced the last vestige of Italian military supremacy. After 212 A. D. the inhabitants of Rome enjoyed only the unenviable prerogative of being the pauperized pensioners of the empire.

J. THE GROWTH OF A PERMANENT CIVIL SERVICE.

Hirschfeld, "Die kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten bis auf Diocletian," 1905; Mattingly, "The Imperial Civil Service of Rome," 1910.

Finally, we turn to the seventh of Augustus's maxims. This has for us a peculiar significance; for it was by its application that the principate, as we said at the beginning of this article, became the creator of a new administrative system; and in its enactment was grounded the triumph of central over local authority, which we have included in our theme. As a Roman and a "restorer," Augustus felt an instinctive repulsion against discarding any institutions which had been consecrated by long usage. Hence he left unchanged the offices and organs of the capital, notwithstanding that, from their having been evolved when Rome was simply a city-state with a compact homogeneous citizen body, they had become outgrown now that Rome, having become coterminous with Italy and the mistress of the whole Mediterranean world, was at once the governor of countless millions, and the place of residence of 800,000 people of all imaginable races, classes and occupations. Experience, however, showed him that even after he had relieved the city of Rome of the most difficult part of its imperial burdens, its consuls, praetors, aediles and questors were unequal to the task of managing a great city. Hence he paralleled the ancient system of administration by a new one, served by permanent officers (*praefectus urbi*;¹⁹ *praefectus praetorio*, *praefectus annonae*, *praefectus vigilum* and the *curatores viarum, aquarum, operum, and alvei Tiberis*²⁰) supported by adequate corps of trained assistants, and responsible to himself. The theory that Roman nobles were generally competent for urban service, and that they should take turns yearly in urban offices, was found tenable only when the real work of government was assumed by these imperial functionaries. To the provinces, as they had been successively created in republican days, the same theory had been extended, and there, too, Augustus preserved the principle of rotation of provincial commands among the Roman nobles; but he sharpened their responsibility to the senate and himself, whose courts, accordingly, came to be supreme tribunals for official wrong-doing, and he set the practice in his own provinces of retaining the same men in office for many years in succession. This, again, was a step towards a permanent officialdom. On the other hand, no provision for anything of the sort was made in the charters of the new municipalities which he and his successors organized in Italy and the provinces. There, rotation of office among citizens of wealth and standing remained in vigor for a century and a half, and when it was modified in Trajan's and Hadrian's time,

the annually changing officials were not dispensed with, but permanent imperial officials were placed by their side, the old system of administration by local senators and magistrates, who bought their offices and served without salary, being thus paralleled by a new system in which initiative and responsibility rested with central bureaus controlled by the prince. And generally speaking, this paralleling of old or municipal undertakings by new imperial services is characteristic of the principate. Out of the laws and plebiscites, inherited from the republic or enacted since; out of the edicts of the urban and peregrine praetors, and those of the provincial governors (which were probably *tralatitia* from before Augustus's time, though only codified and removed from the discretion of the magistrates in Hadrian's principate); out of the imperial constitutions, the senate's decrees, and the responses of the jurists, grew the great body of the Roman law, stretching across the empire by the side of the municipal and native codes, which it tended to displace. The prince issued gold and silver, the senate copper, coins, supplementing, not supplanting the silver and copper currency issued as of old by various municipalities.²⁰ Upon the quinquennial census prescribed in their charters for Latin municipalities and upon similar registrations of citizens and property, traditional in Greek cities, a provincial census taken by imperial agents was superimposed by Augustus. How much duplication there was, if any, is, however, difficult to determine in this instance.²¹

The abuses which Augustus made it the policy of the principate to correct were nowhere so gross and glaring as in the fiscal service. Here, too, at least in the provinces left under the control of the senate and the rule of the proconsuls, the old system (abolished altogether in the imperial provinces), whereby young noblemen, without financial experience or a chance to get it, supervised as quaestors the collection of the taxes each in his own province for a single year, was paralleled by a new system in which a paid fiscal agent (*procurator Augusti*) was placed for a long term of years at the head of the financial administration of each province. The societies of speculators in taxes, under which the state had suffered during the time of the republic, were controlled but not suppressed by Augustus. Under Tiberius, however, their operations were restricted to spheres where the state could foresee the yield of imposts, and abuse of opportunity was not to be feared—the contracting for the collecting of the 5 per cent. tax on inheritances, the one per cent. tax on sales, the 5 per cent. tax on manumissions, the harbor and other tolls; while the collecting of the rates on land and persons, of which the yield was fixed or estimable, was transferred to the municipalities or assumed by subordinate imperial officials. There can be no denying that

²⁰ Seeck, *op. cit.*, below K, Vol. II, pp. 191 ff.

²¹ Arnold, *op. cit.*, above I, pp. 100 ff.; Pauly-Wissowa, "Real-encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft," III, pp. 1918 ff.; Hirschfeld, *op. cit.*, above J, pp. 53 ff.; Reid, *op. cit.*, above I, pp. 447 ff.

¹⁹ Established definitely by Tiberius.

these measures had the effect of limiting the freedom and field of activity of the local authorities and that they tended to increase the burdens (*munera*) of the municipal senators and magistrates while they lessened sensibly their honors. At the same time, it must be observed that they constituted by no means so rigorous or far-reaching an interference with local liberties as is customary nowadays—without decay of civic pride or national patriotism—in highly centralized states like modern France and Germany. They, of course, tended to change the aspects of town life. And in this they had the strong support of peace and stability of government. As the *pax Romana* endured, cities everywhere sloughed off their armor and cashiered their diplomatic corps. All their national, as distinct from their municipal, activities were discontinued gradually, and the relations with foreign states, which had once made their citizens stand constantly on the *qui vive*, were transformed into dull administrative settlements with the local fiscal agent, the perambulating provincial governor, and the far distant emperor. Generally speaking, however, we may contend with a good deal of reason that all that was evolving in the Roman empire prior to the collapse of the central government in the middle of the third century, A. D., was a healthy municipality of the modern type. Prior to that date, at any rate, the material prosperity of the towns was unimpaired.

K. THE EVOLUTION OF BUREAUCRACY.

Seeck, "Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt," 1895-1913; Rostowzew, "Studien zur Geschichte des römischen Kolonates," 1910; Mitteis und Wilcken, "Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyrskunde," 1912; Kornemann, "Aegypten und das Reich," in Gerke und Norden's "Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft," 1912, pp. 272 ff.

The elements of a permanent administrative service came in this way into being during the course of the principate. Each new official or new group of officials was connected with the prince, the common appointee, wage payer, and comptroller, and from him all derived the executive and judicial powers requisite for their acts. But the several elements were not knit together in a compact whole. They were intended to be patches on an old cloak rather than the warp of a new garment, which, when it none the less appeared, proved to be a shroud, or rather, to change the figure, a suit of mail like the famous Iron Maiden at Nürnberg. But the tendency to organize—the *furor Germanicus*, so to speak—the tendency to separate the sphere and apparatus of finance from the army, of which it became the servant, and to combine the fiscal agents in a sort of civil army, parallel to the other, proved in the long run irresistible. And in Egypt, of which the prince had been, from the first Pharaoh, an excellent model was constantly at hand. Its influence is most clearly perceptible in the management of the private property of the prince—the other private property, we should say, for Egypt as a whole was his personal estate. His other estates were smaller individually, though after Nero's con-

fiscations they comprised the half of all Africa, but they were widely scattered and collectively enormous.²² For them a graduated system of fiscal agents (*procuratores*) had been created with a *procurator patrimonii* established by Claudius at their head, and when Vespasian (69-79 A. D.) lumped with his patrimony the public land of the state and brought the whole complex under one management,²³ this spread its tentacles all over the empire. Its head, the famous comptroller of accounts (*a rationibus*) was included in the private household of the prince. At first he was a freedman of the prince, and his assistants, when not slaves, were of the same class. And the like was true of the two other great private servants of the prince, his secretary (*ab epistulis*) and his receiver of petitions (*a libellis*). But to them Claudius gave the insignia of Roman magistrates while "his revenue officers in the provinces (*procuratores*) received the most distinctive prerogatives of public magistrates, jurisdiction."²⁴ This was tantamount to surrendering the most influential posts in the imperial service to freedmen,²⁵ and so it remained till Hadrian, obliterating "the old distinction once so earnestly maintained between the public service of the state and the private service of Cæsar,"²⁶ closed to freedmen these great household bureaus of the prince and the more important offices in the empire attached to them, put them under the general control of his *alter ego*, the praetorian prefect, and made them accessible thereafter only to knights. This done, the system centralized in the palace could spread without let or hindrance throughout the entire empire, and, as a matter of fact, when, in the late third century, after the great upheaval of the Thirty Tyrants and the misery of the German invasions, Diocletian joined together all the public services in a vast bureaucracy, it was in the bureaus over which the comptroller of accounts, the secretary, and the receiver of petitions had once presided that it had its head.

Three prominent Englishmen agree, in recent magazine articles, that any satisfactory treaty of peace following the European war must include the abolishment of militarism and the arrangement of the European state system upon the basis of nationality. The articles referred to are the following: "When the War is Over," by George Macaulay Trevelyan, the historian, "McClure's," December; "Thoughts on the War," by Professor Gilbert Murray, of Oxford, "Hibbert Journal," October; "The War and the Way Out," by Professor G. Lowes Dickinson, of Cambridge, "Atlantic Monthly," December. Professor Murray also makes much of the fact that the Congress of Vienna of 1815 abolished the great evil of trade in slaves, and suggests that in these enlightened and progressive days a peace congress should be able to accomplish much more. There must be "no revenge, no deliberate humiliation of any enemy, no picking and stealing."

²² Hirschfeld, "Klio," 1902, pp. 45 ff., 284 ff.

²³ Rostowzew, *op. cit.*, above K, pp. 326 ff.

²⁴ Pelham, "Essays," pp. 40, 163.

²⁵ Hirschfeld, *op. cit.*, above J, pp. 271 ff.

The War and the Future of Civilization¹

BY ROLAND G. USHER.

The defense alleged by all the nations at present involved in the European war hinges upon the necessity of their continued existence to insure the future of civilization. Nor can we claim with a shadow of truth that the insistence upon this point is more vigorous at Berlin than it is in London or in Paris. We shall surely be lacking in fairness if we question the sincerity with which all these European nations tenaciously cling to the notion that they are indispensable to the happiness of future generations. We shall, however, be quite as lacking in candor and intelligence if we fail to see that each of these nations assumes a knowledge of the ultimate end and aim of civilization, coupled to a clear insight into the process by which that ultimate aim must be attained, to an ability to see the chain of connection binding the present to this dim and ultimate future, and, of course, to an analysis of the present situation so complete and accurate as to distinguish the elements necessary to insure the future.

We find it personally a little difficult to concede to any of the nations the gift of prophecy and an ability to read the writing in the stars. Can we be absolutely positive that the future of the human race let us say, depends upon the ruling of Asia, Africa, or South America by any European nation? In the face of the fact that every religious creed which has shown any strength in history has come out of Asia, can we believe that upon the direction of the occidental nations depends the spiritual progress of the human race? We find in Europe at present two different notions of administration; one called parliamentary government and the other bureaucratic government. The one works admirably in England, and rather badly elsewhere; the other is astonishingly efficient in Germany, and less conspicuously useful in other countries. Shall we not really need the powers of a seventh son to tell which of these is more essential to the world at large? We find in England a notion of individual liberty which, on the whole, allows the individual to do pretty much anything he wants to until some other individual sues him in court. The government is to arbitrate between the two, but is to direct neither. In Germany the government promulgates sets of rules regarding the conduct of individuals toward each other, and compels individuals to observe them. The citizens of both nations claim that the results are as nearly ideal as anything is likely to be in this imperfect world.

If we look into the past, we shall find it difficult to concede to any generation the ability to tell in advance what will benefit or will injure civilization. The downfall of political Greece, which seemed to many contemporaries certain to destroy Greek culture

forever, was in fact the instrumentality by which Greek culture was spread throughout the civilized world and made almost universal. Scarcely a Roman citizen could have been found in the fourth century, A. D., who would not have bewailed the invasions of the "barbarous" Germans as the death of civilization. Indeed, educated men were pretty positive for nearly a thousand years that the Barbarians had destroyed civilization. Of this the Renaissance had no doubt whatever, and named the centuries subsequent to the fall of Rome and previous to their own time as the dark ages, when the light of civilization had been quenched. It is an astonishingly different notion of the Barbarian invasions which we find in the pages of ardent Teutonists like Lamprecht or Chamberlain. They are quite convinced that those centuries saw the dawn of civilization. In 1630 Gustavus Adolphus arrived in Germany for the purpose of saving civilization, which he identified with Protestantism, yet he succeeded (as most authorities are now agreed) in wrecking and desolating Germany, and he was certainly one of the chief authors of her poverty and weakness in the two succeeding centuries. Nor do we see at present eye to eye with the savior of civilization in 1815. Louis XVII and the Duke of Wellington now occupy quite unenviable positions as blind reactionaries in the path of progress, while for those masters of foreign politics, George Canning and Metternich, whose policies and speeches impressed their contemporaries as utterances divinely inspired, we have scarcely a respectful word. Yet in 1815 there was probably no individual whom his contemporaries would have considered sane who did not breathe fervent prayers of thanks in the belief that the future of civilization was now assured, having passed into the hands of its saviors.

Do we not also learn from the history of the past that it is almost impossible for contemporaries to judge correctly in deciding whether resistance to aggression is really a safeguard for the future or merely an attempt of the obsolete and the outworn to retard progress? Few men would now shed tears upon the remains of political Athens; still fewer bemoan the sowing of salt upon the ruins of Carthage. A cold and unsympathetic reception awaits the advocate of the usefulness of imperial Rome of the fourth century A. D. There can be absolutely no doubt that the monasteries rendered indispensable service to the cause of civilization in the early middle ages, not only by the preservation of art and letters, but by the preservation of technical skill in many mechanical trades. But in the sixteenth century the monastic orders had no friends sufficiently ardent and powerful to ward off destruction, and there are not many students to-day who are inclined to question the general gain for civilization by the breaking of their power.

Surely, if in the whole range of history we come

¹ Reprinted by permission from "The New Republic" for November 7, 1914.

upon a country which believed its own efforts indispensable for the progress of the race, it was Renaissance Italy, and it was more nearly right than contemporaries usually have been; but the political power of Italy was then, and remained until the nineteenth century, a shadow. Few countries in the whole history of the race have achieved such whole-hearted and unanimous admiration as France possessed in the eighteenth century. Its very name was synonymous with what was to contemporaries civilization itself; its loss or destruction would have seemed irreparable. Yet in 1815 practically the whole civilized world congratulated itself upon the downfall, nay, upon the practical destruction of France, and upon the consequent saving of civilization.

If there is anything in the tenet of the relativity of truth, we have not now and are not likely to have any notion of what is really indispensable to the future of civilization, because we have not and cannot have a definite notion of what the future of civilization is. It ought to be sufficient for us to remember that northwestern Europe, which we now look upon as the seat of civilization, was, at the birth of Christ, scarcely known to be upon the globe, and was in all honesty believed by scientists to be the place where the world came to an end and space began. And in the history of the race and of the world two thousand years are but a moment. In reality we are dealing to-day with essentially different notions of civilization, of its object, of the methods necessary to attain it, of the hands which will perform the work. It is the difference of opinion about the future which lies at the root of the present difficulty,

and in that opinion we shall find, as in a looking-glass, the images of the nations as they successively step forward. They differ in their national character, their ideas of morality, their ideas of the future because of their past. Their national aims and ambitions are the result of the history of Europe, the result of their deep hatreds, antagonisms, and rivalries during the fifteen hundred years since their ancestors poured down from the forests of the North upon the provinces of decadent Rome. From such a long and tangled past have come deep-rooted ideas, intense passions, strong beliefs, determinations to prevail. It is with these we have to deal.

Somehow, in some way of which we know nothing, the future civilization will emerge, as in the past, from the clash of these ideals and ambitions. The past makes it clear that civilization will be safeguarded, whatever happens. The future no more depends upon a single race or a single nation than a nation depends upon a single individual. When we talk of worlds, of aeons of time, of the human race itself and the future of its civilization, nations, like individuals, become pygmies and almost disappear from sight. We cannot tell in advance what the future is going to be, we cannot tell in advance which of us will render the service which will be seen a thousand years hence to have been important; but surely we can all be pardoned for believing that we have some part to play in it. The real problem with which we have to deal is not that of providing for civilization's future, but that of providing for the immediate future of those of us who are now alive.

Early Methods in Teaching History in Secondary Schools

Part I

BY PROFESSOR WILLIAM F. RUSSELL, GEORGE PEABODY COLLEGE FOR TEACHERS, NASHVILLE, TENN.

The task of estimating the character of present-day classroom instruction is a difficult one at best. When the problem becomes one of tracing the evolution of method, of judging the teaching of generations ago, this difficulty is greatly increased. The information must come from source material, from those fragments of the writings and records of the past which happen to have been preserved.¹ This means, of necessity, that the material is not complete; that the whole story cannot be told, and that the results of this investigation can be considered only as indicative of the true conditions of the time.

"When the institution was commencing its existence," said the principal of Albany Female Academy in 1838, "two methods of instruction divided the schools. In the colleges, lectures were given, ex-

planations made and books provided, that the student might extend his researches upon his subject beyond the author studied. This we think a plan for beginning a study, which being right will never be improved. The other method, which was pursued in elementary schools, was to make the scholar say his lessons, no matter whether he understood them or not. This we hold to be a miserable method to begin to teach a subject."² This division of methods, in general, has persisted to the present day. The teaching in the institutions of higher learning has always been principally through lectures; the text-book has remained the chief source of material for the secondary school.

Method makes progress slowly. Teachers, conservative at best, are slow to adopt innovations. Individuals may experiment successfully, but results in general practice are attained only after a long period of time. In consequence general development is difficult to trace. It is proposed first to consider the

¹ The data are (1) the remarks of men who were trained at the time; (2) the introductions, prefaces and "remarks to teachers" in early text-books; and (3) a rather remarkable collection of reports from academy principals, collected by Gideon Hawley, and published in the reports of the New York Regents in the years 1835-1847.

² New York, "Report of the Regents of the University to the Senate," 1838, p. 88.

general methods in use during the first four decades of the nineteenth century; second, to note the various teaching devices and aids to classroom instruction as they were introduced, and third, to attempt to trace the effect upon classroom procedure through their incorporation in the text-books. Finally, a general consideration of exceptional teaching in early days will be tested in the light of modern standards.

A. General Methods in Use.

1. THE LECTURE METHOD.

Occasional academies and high schools resorted to the lecture method. Yates County Academy reported in 1837:

"The general mode of instruction is by familiar lectures in the higher classes, sometimes required to be given by the more advanced scholars."³

Oncida Institute, in 1839, advocated the lecture method in the following way:

"The last year I pursued a different course. I prepared lectures upon the several subjects belonging to mental science, and delivered them to the students of my classroom. The time allotted to this subject was, one day, consumed by the lecture; on the next day a recitation was had upon the subject and the matter of the lecture. In this way we proceeded, till with a good degree of thoroughness and success, we disposed of the topics commonly attended to in this department of study. In the same way instruction was given in . . . political economy and the science of government.

"As an instructor, I suppose my business is mainly to impart an impulse, and to afford guidance. Adherence to the text-book seems to me to be prejudicial to the object I am bound to promote in both respects. An instructor is supposed to be more or less acquainted with what he undertakes to teach; to have put himself in possession of what he offers to impart. Will he not be likely to feel a livelier interest in his work and to impress himself more deeply and permanently on his pupils, if he is permitted and encouraged to express his own thoughts in his own way, than if he is required or expected to repeat the sayings of another? Besides, if he is much given to observation and reflection, he may often find occasion to differ from any of our various text-books. If he should agree with them in the main principles and leading doctrines which they maintain, he may prefer other methods and illustrations. . . . The text-book can hardly fail to be in the way of an instructor who is at all given to thinking. . . . He will now find it necessary to spend time in removing rubbish, and now in filling up a chasm; and amid criticisms and corrections and supplements, the student all raw and unpracticed will lose himself."⁴

Interspersed in the various reports are occasional references to lectures. One reads of "familiar lectures," "of familiar illustrations on the part of the teacher." These terms, in all probability, were a portion of the pedagogical language of the day. In certain of the reports, where lists of the texts used in various classes are given, one finds that Roman or Greek or Biblical "antiquities" were taught by lectures. The teaching of history without the use of a

text-book, one of the earliest methods in use, never gained a firm foothold in the secondary schools of the United States; and while it has persisted even to the present time, it has been of comparatively little significance.

2. THE TEXT-BOOK METHODS.

Nearly all subjects in the secondary schools were commonly presented with the aid of a text-book. This was particularly true of history. Before the year 1860 three hundred and sixty texts, running into at least eight hundred and fifteen editions,⁵ were published in history alone. The number of text-books, reported in use in the New York academies, show the popularity of this method there.

So important is this type, and so wide are the ramifications within its limits, that its various phases must be taken up separately, if we are to treat it adequately.

(a) Rote Work.

A common method of teaching history was to provide a pupil with a text-book, to be learned and recited word for word. The recitation, then, in a literal sense, was a period provided for the "recitation" of the pages learned. The arguments found in the reports and the suggestions gathered from the text-books bear witness to the popularity of this method. On the other hand, the excuses offered for it and modifications reported, as well as the statewide discussion and opposition, show quite as clearly the prevalence of instruction of this sort.

Early texts are zealous in their recommendation of rote work. Such suggestions as "the pupil should first commit to memory the political divisions;" "that the three first pages should be well committed to memory"⁶ are common. C. A. Goodrich, in his "History of the United States," published in 1822, said:

"1. The general division should be first very thoroughly committed to memory.

"2. That portion of the work which is in large type embraces the leading subjects of history, and should be committed to memory by the pupil. That part which is in smaller type should be carefully perused.

"3. It is recommended to the teachers not to make a severe examination of the pupil until a second or third time going through the book. This should be more particularly observed in regard to young and backward pupils."⁷

When it is considered that 150,000 copies of this book are said to have been sold before 1834, and 500,000 before 1870,⁸ the recommendation is more significant. It may be mentioned that the "smaller type to be perused" makes up only a small portion of the book.

Rote work, particularly with reference to more im-

⁵ See later paper.

⁶ J. L. Blake, "Text-Book in Geography and Chronology with Historical Sketches," 1814.

⁷ C. A. Goodrich, "History of the United States," 1824, p. 3.

⁸ C. A. Jacquith, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

³ New York, *op. cit.*, 1837, p. 100.

⁴ New York, *op. cit.*, 1839, pp. 119-20.

portant sections, was not without its earliest advocates among the teachers themselves. The principal of De Ruyter Institute reports in 1838:

"To this course (rote work) we rigidly intend to adhere, as it is thought that there is great danger of obtaining only a superficial knowledge of studies, by permitting students in their answer to give, as it is termed, the substance of the author."⁹

Plattsburg Academy in 1840 says:

"We require to be committed to memory exactly in the language of the text-book. We think that by that course we not only secure as good or better understanding of the principles required to be learned, as is obtained by leaving pupils to express the idea in their own language, but we also secure a habit of precision and accuracy of language, which the other system tends rather to destroy."¹⁰

Kinderhook Academy in 1841 said:

"If the author has not expressed the idea in the best language, he is deficient and ought not to be used; and if his own expression is good, let the pupil commit it as it stands, rather than take up that which is inferior."¹¹

Auburn Academy in 1839 took the following stand:

"With regard to the question to what extent the processes of education may usefully be addressed to the mere power of memory, the trustees abstain from entering into that extended course of remark concerning it, without which it would be impossible to do justice to the subject. The great purposes of education are to store the mind (which in this sense is but another name for memory) with useful knowledge; and in the process of doing so to give increased energy, activity and precision to the mental faculties.

"Any system of instruction which is not directed to each of these ends is radically erroneous. . . .

"There is in this age of the world an abundant store of useful knowledge, in the acquisition of which to give ample exercise to all the faculties; and what is worth acquiring is worth remembering. Any mode of instruction, therefore, which does not systematically and studiously aim at the accomplishment of this as one of its primary ends, must be defective."¹²

Johnstown Academy made the following statement in 1837:

"Yet in all instances, the memory as well as the understanding, must be cultivated. It is the depository of knowledge, the reservoir from which we derive, and from which we draw those streams of learning which we may apply on any future or contingent emergency. Without a proper cultivation of this useful faculty no impression would be lasting, all knowledge would become evanescent, and every effort to render learning practically useful would necessarily prove abortive."¹³

Whitesboro Academy reports in 1840 as follows:

"It is a frequent complaint with individuals that they soon forget all that they have learned at school. Young men, too, in leaving our colleges to teach, frequently find that they know nothing of the subjects in which they thought themselves well versed. They have not a clear idea

of first principles. It has been our aim to give clear and distinct ideas, and implant them so firmly in the memory, that time cannot eradicate them. The means used to accomplish this, has been constant repetition."¹⁴

Similar expressions of tendencies favoring rote work are found in the reports of Hartwick Seminary,¹⁵ Washington Academy,¹⁶ Rochester High School,¹⁷ Kinderhook Academy,¹⁸ Whitesboro Academy,¹⁹ and Genessee Wesleyan.²⁰

(b) *Modified Forms of Rote Work.*

The radical views just cited were not held by all teachers of the time. More liberal methods were advocated by many. The transition is gradual, and many and varied are the excuses and explanations offered to account for the change.

Some teachers hold to the old method, while presenting an explanation to their critics. For illustration, the Onondaga Academy said, in 1838:

"If I had a student so unfortunately constituted as to be incapable of thinking and reasoning upon a subject, I enjoin upon him to commit his rules to memory, content to make him an apt machine, if I cannot make him a skillful accountant, for with such an explanation it soon becomes like everything else that they may learn, a matter of rote."²¹

The principal of Troy Female Seminary replied as follows:

"There are certain subjects of study, which must, of course, be learned memoriter. . . . But in such subjects as history, . . . etc., the method of requiring a few sentences to be repeated by rote, is wholly absurd. . . . The teacher's first business is to make his pupils understand the subject, etc. . . . When the author's own clue to the subject is once fairly obtained, fluency of speech will follow, and the pupil of taste will rarely fail of committing to memory the finest passages of the finest writers, and we consider that taste and style are both improved in the exercise. Such a pupil may be said by the ignorant to recite memoriter; but the better informed perceive by the eye, intonation and the emphasis, that the words used stand in the mind of the speaker as signs of ideas, which he has by study, made his own."²²

Another tendency is to emphasize both understanding and memory, but in a reverse order. Plattsburg Academy said in 1837, for instance, that the pupil must show that "not only has he learned exactly his lessons, but that he also understands them."²³ Cambridge Washington Academy reports, "Many students have committed to memory the Constitution of the United States, and had it familiarly explained to them."²⁴

⁹ New York, *op. cit.*, 1838, p. 99.

¹⁰ New York, *op. cit.*, 1839, p. 119.

¹¹ New York, *op. cit.*, 1839, p. 116.

¹² New York, *op. cit.*, 1836, p. 73.

¹³ New York, *op. cit.*, 1844, p. 141.

¹⁴ New York, *op. cit.*, 1840, p. 99.

¹⁵ New York, *op. cit.*, 1840, p. 100.

¹⁶ New York, *op. cit.*, 1837, p. 100.

¹⁷ New York, *op. cit.*, 1838, p. 90.

¹⁸ New York, *op. cit.*, 1837, p. 88.

¹⁹ New York, *op. cit.*, 1838, p. 92.

⁹ New York, *op. cit.*, 1838, p. 94.

¹⁰ New York, *op. cit.*, 1840, p. 94.

¹¹ New York, *op. cit.*, 1841, p. 92.

¹² New York, *op. cit.*, 1839, p. 126.

¹³ New York, *op. cit.*, 1837, p. 90.

A compromise often made is illustrated by the following excerpt from the report of the Delaware Academy in 1838:

"All definitions and rules are required to be given in the precise language of the author; in most other parts of the branches of study the student is allowed to clothe the author's meaning in his own words."²⁵

This is the most common form of belief in regard to rote work which was held by the school men during this period, if frequency of mention in the reports is an indication. Among the schools showing this same tendency were Gouverneur High School,²⁶ Westfield Academy,²⁷ Johnstown Academy,²⁸ Poughkeepsie Female Academy,²⁹ and Amenia Seminary.³⁰

A scheme calculated to preserve the advantages of memoriter work, with the avoidance of many of its dangers, was attempted in many academies. Jefferson Academy reported in 1836 that:

"Originating and writing out questions . . . (without reference to any questions of the author) three or four on a lesson, with a memoriter answer is required. The pupils are admonished that a comparative estimate of scholarship will be made by a comparative estimate of the importance of the questions brought forward."³¹

Thoughtful attention to the content of the subject and careful endeavor in estimating the relative importance of its various parts were here combined with the earnest effort in learning the exact answer, which was so much to be desired. A phase of this same idea was held at Jefferson Academy,³² Amenia Seminary,³³ Newburgh Academy,³⁴ Ridgebury Academy,³⁵ Monroe Academy,³⁶ and many others. At Amenia Seminary in 1839, it was said:

"We insist upon familiarity with the subject, and our questions are frequently so directed that the answer cannot be given in the language of the author. But while we object strongly to that course of instruction which permits the student to recite page after page of the author's words, without a proper understanding of his ideas, we think the opposite extreme should be avoided with care. For though it may have a tendency to cultivate habits of thought, it would in more instances lead to habits of superficial reading, and in the end to habits of superficial investigating."³⁷

Albany Female Academy presented in 1839, the following plan of combining rote work, with adequate understanding of the principles involved:

"We concur with the secretary in the opinion that many subjects at first addressed to the understanding in such a

manner as to elicit thought, to teach it to make nice discriminations, and to take general, comprehensive and connected views should then be committed to memory, that the mind may always have them at command, and be able to communicate them.

"Our mode of instruction is directed to these two objects. The pupil is first required to exercise her own power of investigation on any subject. She is examined on it in the daily recitation by the teacher, who then explains and illustrates it in a familiar lecture, in such a manner as will be interesting, fix the attention, and awaken the curiosity. (The teachers, of course, must examine the best works on the subjects they teach, and we provide books for this purpose.) At the next recitation the pupil is required either in answer to questions or by way of analysis, as the subject may be, to give a connected view of the leading ideas of the author in her own language. After thus acquiring a knowledge of the subject, she is required to write an analysis of the most prominent and useful ideas contained in the text-book, making her own selections and employing her own language, or that of her author, as is most convenient. She has thus become perfectly familiar with the subject, and the remaining duty of committing to memory, and explaining in a clear and correct manner, becomes an easy task, while it secures to her the attainment she has made."³⁸

(c) No Rote Work.

Contemporaneous with, and a possible cause of, these modifications of the memoriter method, was a vigorous opposition to the rote type of teaching. So important, indeed, did the controversy become, that Gideon Hawley, the secretary of the Regents of the University of New York, sent out a questionnaire, calling for the several opinions of the New York academies upon this question. This was repeated for a number of years.

Albany Academy replied as follows in 1835:

"It has ever been a leading object in this institution, as soon as the age of the pupil will allow, to persuade him to commit the substance of his lessons rather than the actual words."³⁹

Alfred Academy said:

"The common practice of students to commit to memory the language of the book merely without searching deeply into the instructions designed to be conveyed, has been carefully guarded against, and they have been required to commit ideas, rather than words or sounds, and to give an accurate analysis of every portion of each lesson in their own language."⁴⁰

Livingston County High School answered in 1840:

"Recitations 'by rote' or memoriter recitations are never received as satisfactory."⁴¹

"An author's answer to a question *verbatim* is rarely heard,"⁴² comes from Lowville Academy in 1836. "There is less memoriter work in this institution than perhaps in most others."⁴³ is the truly pedagogical answer of Black River Literary and Re-

²⁵ New York, *op. cit.*, 1839, p. 109.

²⁶ New York, *op. cit.*, 1839, p. 115.

²⁷ New York, *op. cit.*, 1840, p. 105.

²⁸ New York, *op. cit.*, 1836, p. 90.

²⁹ New York, *op. cit.*, 1838, p. 84.

³⁰ New York, *op. cit.*, 1839, p. 103.

³¹ New York, *op. cit.*, 1836, p. 58.

³² New York Report, 1835, pp. 58-9.

³³ New York Report, 1837, p. 78.

³⁴ New York Report, 1839, p. 107.

³⁵ New York Report, 1840, p. 89.

³⁶ New York Report, 1836, p. 72.

³⁷ New York Report, 1839, p. 103.

³⁸ New York, *op. cit.*, 1839, pp. 113-4.

³⁹ New York, *op. cit.*, 1835, p. 57.

⁴⁰ New York Report, 1844, p. 151.

⁴¹ New York Report, 1840, p. 101.

⁴² New York Report, 1836, p. 64.

⁴³ New York Report, 1840, p. 98.

ligious Institute in 1840. Similar expressions come from Lowville Academy,⁴⁴ Canandaigua Academy,⁴⁵ Schenectady Academy,⁴⁶ Essex County Academy,⁴⁷ Rensselaer Owego Institute,⁴⁸ and many others.

Upon occasions, faculty psychology worked to the disadvantage of memoriter teaching. When education was believed to consist in the proper training of the various mental faculties, the emphasis upon memory alone would put an undue tax upon a single faculty to the neglect of the rest. An illustration of this argument is found for Genesee Wesleyan Academy for 1838.

"Rules and definitions, being expressed with conciseness in text-books, are committed verbatim. But in regard to principles a different method is preferred for obvious reasons. First, to commit an author's language is an undue tax upon the memory to the neglect of the other faculties of the mind. Science is designed to strengthen and regulate the mind, as a whole. Second, a memorizer may recite fluently while he knows little or nothing intrinsically of the subject submitted to his investigation. The scholar should always be able to state in his own language, the principles he embraces as true, otherwise the slightest failure in memory will involve him in embarrassment. Words may be easily forgotten, but facts engraven on the memory have a more permanent duration. Store the mind with truths and principles, and language will not be wanting in which to clothe them."⁴⁹

Rochester Collegiate Institute reported as follows in 1849:

"But in the teaching of history, . . . etc., what demand ought to be made upon the memory of the pupil? Shall the pupil be required to commit the whole lesson to memory? By practice students can be brought to recite pages memoriter at a time; but will they long retain the knowledge thus acquired? All experience, except in a few very uncommon cases, replies in the negative.

"A far better method than this is, so to study the lesson that the pupil may be able to give the facts, thoughts, speculations, in his own language, and in the language which is far removed from that of the author, provided it is only correct and precise. This involves what is called an analysis of the text-book. But analysis is ever a profitable method of study. By practice it becomes easier than mere learning memoriter, and will abide longer in the memory. True, the demand on the teacher is greater, for he must himself know the author, in order to be able to hear an analysis of the lesson and know its correctness or the contrary."⁵⁰

Gouverneur High School reports upon the success following the abandonment of rote work. They say:

"We have witnessed with increasing satisfaction the success of our attempts to charge the minds of the pupils with ideas rather than burden their memories with words. The practice of memorizing the words of a text-book, and reciting them verbatim, can scarcely fail to divert the attention of the student from the fact that they are intending

to communicate, and result in disgust and discouragement."⁵¹

To conclude, rote work had its champions for the first half of the nineteenth century. Teachers were not afraid to argue openly in favor of it. The method was not in disrepute. A well defined opposition, however, was beginning to grow up, which resulted in frequent modifications of, and, in localities, the abandonment of memoriter methods.

It is interesting, then, to note the optimistic statement of C. E. Bush, made in Berard's "History of the United States," in 1878, that:

"The days of assigning lessons by the page and of listening to memoriter recitations (text-book in hand to insure a verbatim repetition of the author's language), are fast passing away. The methods of the time demand that the teachers shall actually teach, and that the recitations shall be tests of the pupils' real grasp on the subject under consideration."⁵²

(d) *The Catechetical Method.*

In a sense, every recitation is a case of question and answer. Even a memoriter exercise necessitates this. But in the sense here used, the catechetical method differentiates itself in that it puts its emphasis upon the text not so much as a matter of phrasing, as upon the proper development of the thought brought out. There is every gradation of this method from rote work in a mechanical fashion, to questions dealing with real problems to be solved, and active solutions to the same.

Many of the early texts were built upon such a plan as to facilitate the easy use of the question and answer method. A popular form was that of a series of questions and answers. Among the text-books showing such organization are:

Bingham, "A Historical Grammar."
Goodrich, "Stories of the History of Connecticut."
Dunlap, "A History of New York."
Derry, "A History of the United States."
Butler, "A Catechetical Compend of General History, etc."

For purposes of illustration, the contents of page 171 of Bingham are given:

"Q. Did the Emperor Leopold live late in this century?
"A. He died in one thousand seven hundred and five, at the age of sixty-five.
"Q. Who succeeded him?
"A. His son Joseph, who died in the year one thousand seven hundred and eleven, at the age of thirty-three.
"Q. To whom did the empire afterwards devolve?
"A. To his brother, Charles VI, Archduke of Austria, and competitor with Philip V for the crown of Spain. He was the last Emperor of the house of Austria.
"Q. How long did he reign?
"A. To the year one thousand seven hundred and forty. He died at the age of fifty-five, and left his hereditary estates to the Archduchess Maria Theresa, his daughter by Elizabeth Christiana, of the house of Wolfenbuttle.
"Q. On whom was the imperial dignity then conferred?
"A. On the Elector of Bavaria, who took the name of

⁴⁴ New York, *op. cit.*, 1836, p. 64.

⁴⁵ New York, *op. cit.*, 1839, p. 127.

⁴⁶ New York, *op. cit.*, 1837, p. 87.

⁴⁷ New York, *op. cit.*, 1841, p. 95.

⁴⁸ New York, *op. cit.*, 1837, p. 95.

⁴⁹ New York, *op. cit.*, 1838, p. 98.

⁵⁰ New York, *op. cit.*, 1849, p. 165.

⁵¹ New York, *op. cit.*, 1840, pp. 93-4.

⁵² C. E. Bush, "Berard's History of the United States."

Charles VII. He died in one thousand seven hundred and forty-five, after an unquiet and unfortunate reign.

"Q. Who succeeded him?"⁵³

Frequently there were books written in dramatic form, with a patriarch or precocious youth as the fount of wisdom, while children of varying ages provided the situation for the intended response. A child, the junior of the others, is often included, for the purpose of asking easy or obvious questions, either for the guidance or the amusement of the student. The opening questions of Dunlap's "History of New York" are quoted as an illustration:

"CHAPTER I.

"The interlocutors are three boys: John, aged 14; William, aged 12; Philip, aged 10; one girl, Mary, aged 8; and their uncle, aged 71.

"WILLIAM. Now, that Uncle Philip has gone away, will you not tell us the history of New York during the war? You know he only told us how the quarrels began between America and England, and the most curious things happened after that. Now, do you tell us, Uncle; you are older than Uncle Philip, and ought to know more.

"UNCLE. That does not follow, my boy; Uncle Philip knows by reading. A man can know but little who does not read; he has read more than I have.

"MARY. But you have seen all the people he told us about.

"UNCLE. Oh, no, child. Do you suppose that I saw Henry Hudson?

"JOHN. Hush, Mary. You should remember dates; Uncle Thomas told us he is 71 years old; and, of course, he can only remember what passed fifty or sixty years ago.

"PHILIP. Uncle might remember many things that Uncle Philip could only know from hearsay, or reading them.

"MARY. I am 8 years last June, and I remember a long, long time.

"PHILIP. Now, sir, you will oblige us all very much if you will go on with the stories of old times. You have read all the books as well as Uncle Philip, and know some things of your own besides.

"UNCLE. Well, children, I will do as you wish; but I must first examine in respect to what you have been told. Do you think that you remember the first part of the history of New York sufficiently to understand the second?

"MARY. Oh, yes, sir; I remember all about Indians—

"JOHN. Hush, Mary."⁵⁴

This method was popular in the New York academies. At Albany in 1837 was used:

"What has been styled the interrogative system, and principally introduced into notice by Mr. Wood, of Edinburgh."⁵⁵

In Schenectady in the same year was reported that

"It is required of pupils at their recitations to give the ideas of their author in their own language—prompt answers to questions, the test of their understandings."⁵⁶

In Gaines Academy at the same time

"The teachers made it their constant aim by familiar illustrations and by alternate questions and answers, to

secure the voluntary exercise of the mind, by thus rendering the recitations pleasing as well as instructive."⁵⁷

At Poughkeepsie Female Academy in 1836:

"Analyses are drawn out by the pupils themselves, after having gone over them once in the way of question and answer. . . . Instruction is likewise accompanied with such verbal explanations and remarks on all various studies as the teacher may deem necessary."⁵⁸

Jefferson Academy in 1835 reports in a rather complete way one way of prosecution of this method:

"To a class of a dozen pupils is given a lesson. . . . They are first required to read the chapter cursorily, marking, however, any passage that strikes the mind very forcibly, with a pencil. They are next required without any concert to write out five (more or less) of the most important questions they can originate by a critical review and study of the chapter, and to deliver these questions to the teacher, at the recitation seat, giving him answers from memory; these answers being the sentiments (not necessarily the words of the author) or the results of their own observations or readings. It is, I imagine, readily seen, that a high ambition is hereby produced between several members of the class to bring forward a better selection of questions, each than any of the rest, as well as necessarily a stimulated exercise of the judgment, and a critical examination of other parts of the lesson than those brought forward. This, of course, does not preclude the teacher from bringing up at the recitation any important topic, unduly neglected by any or all of the class."⁵⁹

(To be continued in the February number.)

LOUISIANA UNIVERSITY HIGH SCHOOL RALLY DAY.

CONTRIBUTED BY PROF. MILLEDGE L. BENHAM, JR.

In the MAGAZINE for May, 1910, (page 208) is an account of the history exhibit at the annual high school rally of the Louisiana State University. This exhibit consisted of history notebooks prepared by high school pupils and sent to the University. Prizes were given for the best and second exhibits, comprising all the books of a given class. These prizes included an illuminated certificate, framed for hanging, which contained the names of the class, the principal and the teacher, and some valuable historical work, such as Wilson's "American People," Bradford's "Robert E. Lee," etc., was also given to the schools winning first and second place. This plan was continued until the rally of May, 1914, when the History Department decided to vary the contest. In the "Rally Bulletin," a pamphlet published by the University in February, it was announced that the contest would consist of a written examination on the political, social, economic and biographical history of Louisiana. A brief bibliography was given, and teachers of history who wished their classes to contest were invited to write for a more complete bibliography, which with an exhaustive list of topics, was prepared by the History Department.

The results were very encouraging. Representatives of schools from all sections of the State entered, and the general average of the contestants was about 92. The winner made 96. The student handing in the poorest paper (which, however, easily made a pass-mark), in answer to the ques-

(Continued on page 27.)

⁵³ Bingham, *op. cit.*, p. 171.

⁵⁴ Wm. Dunlap, "A History of New York for Schools," pp. 9-10.

⁵⁵ New York, *op. cit.*, 1837, p. 82.

⁵⁶ New York, *op. cit.*, 1837, p. 87.

⁵⁷ New York, *op. cit.*, 1837, p. 102.

⁵⁸ New York, *op. cit.*, 1837, p. 102.

⁵⁹ New York, *op. cit.*, 1835, p. 59.

Value, Content and Method in Mediaeval History¹

BY PROFESSOR JAMES WESTFALL THOMPSON, UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

I. VALUE AND CONTENT.

1. *What is mediaeval history?*—Mediaeval history is that period of the history of Europe and the Mediterranean countries—Asia Minor, Syria, Palestine, Egypt, Africa—which is included between the decline of the Roman Empire and the period of the Renaissance in the fifteenth century.

2. *Origin of the term "Middle Ages."*—The term "Middle Ages" was first used by a Belgian scholar named Rausin in 1639. But the popularity of the phrase dates from Christopher Kellar, a Thuringian teacher, "who late in the seventeenth century [1685-1688-1692] published the Compend which introduced into history the threefold division of ancient, mediaeval and modern" (Burr, "Ancient the Middle Ages," American Historical Review, XVIII, 714).

The phrase has nothing but popular usage to support it, for its implication is unscientific. "It originated in the seventeenth century when men of letters had drawn deeper and deeper of the charmed draught of classical literature. They felt themselves, so they imagined, at one with the master minds of Greece and Rome. And all that filled the interval from the downfall of the Roman world to their own time, the whole previous history of their own people, seemed to them as a chaotic chasm, an interlude, a *middle age* of darkness and barbarity. Nothing could be more unhistorical. There never has been such a middle age. The whole history of modern nations presents one continuity from the first appearance of the Germanic peoples on the historic stage. . . . The alleged middle age, therefore, is neither marked off by a clear line, or any kind of a line from modern history, nor does it constitute in any sense a unity in itself" (Keutgen, "On the Necessity in America of the Study of the Early History of Modern European Nations," Annual Report of the American Historical Association, 1904, p. 94).

The student will find suggestive reading on this subject in:

Burr, "Ancient the Middle Ages," American Historical Review, XVIII, 710-26.

Adams, "Civilization During the Middle Ages," chaps. i, ii.

Keutgen, "Study of the Early History of Modern European Nations," American Historical Association, 1904, pp. 91-106.

Stubbs, "Seventeen Lectures on Mediaeval and Modern History," chaps. ix and x, "Characteristic Differences between Mediaeval and Modern History."

Taylor, "Mediaeval Mind," I, chap. i.

Graves, "History of Education during the Middle Ages," chap. i.

Maitland, "Dark Ages," Introduction, pp. viii-xvii, and 23-31.

Emerton, "Introduction to the Middle Ages," Preface.

Thatcher and Schevill, "Europe in the Middle Ages," pp. 1-5.

Lodge, "Close of the Middle Ages," pp. 515-18.

Robinson, "History of Western Europe," chap. i.

Robinson, "Readings," I, chap. i.

Munro, "History of the Middle Ages," chap. i.

Guizot, "Lectures on the History of Civilization," Series I, pp. 1-35.

Forrest, "Development of Western Civilization," chap. ii.

3. *Original and progressive elements in mediaeval history.*—It is false and unscientific to regard the Middle Ages as a lapse into utter barbarism. Whatever humanity lost because of the decline of ancient culture was amply compensated for by what it gained ultimately in the new order of things. It is improbable that much of essential worth developed in antiquity was ever destroyed. On the other hand, what humanity gained in the way of progress during the Middle Ages is of enormous value. In addition to the heritage from antiquity, which is larger than is sometimes appreciated, the gifts of Christianity and the church, despite much in them that has been reactionary or suppressive, mark a very great advance upon antiquity, both socially and ethically.

A similar high valuation may be put upon the contribution of the Germanic race. "Vulgarly described as barbarians though you find them, they possessed cultural conceptions of their own and institutions of the strongest vitality, allowing of the richest further evolution. They implanted in the Roman soil political institutions which were their very own. They brought with them primitive but elastic systems of civil and criminal law and of legal procedure, and likewise an economic system, novel methods of land tenure and agriculture. Their constitutional and legal systems, moreover, were based on conceptions or convictions fundamentally distinct from anything Roman, but furnishing the main root out of which the most modern democratic institutions have sprung. Their German blood mingled with that of the older inhabitants of Gaul, of Italy, of Spain and Britain, and out of this new nations sprang. These, with the people that had remained at home in the old Germanic lands, henceforth formed one group of nations closely allied, not only by blood, but sharing in the main the same institutions and the same mental culture. It was a new world, whatever its debts to an older one that had passed away, and a world that is still in full vigor" (Keutgen, *op. cit.*, p. 95).

In government and law, in social conditions, in culture, the Middle Ages developed institutions and ideas that would have astonished the Greeks and Romans.

¹ Reproduced from Professor Thompson's "Reference Studies in Mediaeval History," Chicago, 1914.

The state of antiquity was a "city state;" even the Roman Empire was a vast aggregation of cities. Mediaeval Europe developed nations and national monarchy. Rome solved the problem of an efficient centralized government. But government which gave simultaneous and due expression to both central and local interests is the inheritance of modern times through the achievement of the Middle Ages. The ancient world rested upon slave labor; the Middle Ages first ameliorated and then abolished slavery in Europe and reduced serfdom almost to the vanishing point. They created the free agriculturalist, the free merchant, the free craftsman. In literature, the Middle Ages witnessed the evolution of new languages which flowered in forms of literature as rich and varied as those of Greek and Latin literature. In science and the mechanical arts, it is to the Middle Ages that we owe the modern system of notation, algebra, the compass, the magnifying glass, gunpowder, the process of distillation, the use of the chief acids, the discovery of gas, the invention of printing, the windmill, and the organ. To material welfare, the Middle Ages contributed the use of silk, sugar, linen paper; and, largely through the influence of the Arabs, many new vegetable products were made serviceable to mankind.

As the mental and moral horizon was broadened, so also was the physical horizon widened far beyond the limits known to the ancient world. No ancient navigator had rounded the African continent as Vasco da Gama did in 1498, or discovered new lands like the Norse discovery of Iceland and Greenland and Columbus' finding of America. No Greek or Roman adventurer, so far as we know, ever crossed Asia as did Marco Polo. In aesthetics the Middle Ages gave birth to Romanesque and the exquisite Gothic architecture, to painting in oils, to line engraving, to a music far in advance of that which antiquity knew. The weakest points in mediaeval civilization are precisely the weakest points in antiquity and in modern times, and they are inseparable from human nature.

4. *Essential elements in mediaeval history.*—The period of mediaeval history was pre-eminently an institutional epoch when forms and customs were in the making. In consequence, the church, administrative and political powers, social structure, town life, war, trade, agriculture, arts and letters, all constitute important elements in mediaeval history.

Mediaeval civilization was formed of three elements: Greek and Roman, Christian, and German. There were other but more incidental factors, such as the Keltic, Mohammedan, Jewish, Slavonic, and Turanian, but these three are the essential ingredients of mediaeval life. In a sense the Middle Ages were a tumultuous laboratory in which these elements in a greater or less degree were melted and fused together to form the civilization of the time. The proportion of the elements or the degree of fusion was never everywhere equal. In Southern Europe, among the Romance nations, Roman survivals predominated. In Northern Europe, on the other hand,

German influences predominated. There is infinite variety in the mass and texture of mediaeval institutions, and part of the charm and value of studying mediaeval history is to determine the relative proportions of the various elements which formed the complex whole.

5. *Relation of mediaeval history to ancient and modern history.*—The early history of the Middle Ages—the period before 800 A.D.—in a certain sense may be regarded as the epilogue of ancient history. In like manner the later Middle Ages, roughly from 1300 to 1500, may be looked upon as a prologue to modern times. At the end of the fifth century, the history of the Roman Empire almost imperceptibly merged into the period of German ascendancy. By a process as slow as the "weathering" of a great building the Roman Empire disappeared. The migrating Germanic nations replaced the political sovereignty of Rome. Visigoths established themselves in Spain, Vandals in Africa, Lombards in Italy, Franks in Gaul, the English and Saxons in Britain. Their institutions modified or supplanted those of Rome. There was a transfusion of blood, a change in the nature and content of European civilization. This period of transition, roughly embraced by the fifth, sixth, seventh and eighth centuries, is one of darkness and struggle. But gradually out of the dust cloud raised by the horse of the Hun and the confused movement of half-barbarian peoples, the form of the Frank Empire emerges. Coincident with this reorganization of Europe by Charlemagne, the Far East rises into newness of life. The Arabs, welded into a single people by Mohammed, conquered Western Asia, Egypt, the African seaboard, the isles of the Mediterranean, and even part of Spain.

But fate dealt hard with these vast creations. Feudalism destroyed the empire of Charlemagne; the khalifate fell apart of its own weight; yet in each state a unity of faith partially overcame this political disintegration. In Western Europe the unity of the church saved society from entire dissolution, and gradually the Holy Roman Empire, the French and Spanish monarchies, and the English kingship acquired strength and form. But the nascent states were soon called upon to justify their position by another authority—that of the church. The confusion of Church and State in the Middle Ages would have made antagonism between them inevitable, even if the papacy had not centered at Rome. But the strength of Roman imperial tradition, unity of faith, and of church government, the power of ecclesiastical authority, combined with subtler political and personal causes, made the church a vast ecclesiastical empire. Pope and emperor came into collision, and as a result the fate of Germany and Italy, the two component parts of the mediaeval empire, was conditioned for centuries by the issue. This conflict coincided in time with the Crusades in which the whole of Christian Europe was involved with the Mohammedan Orient and the Byzantine Empire. France was little concerned in the struggle of empire and papacy dur-

ing these centuries—the central historic fact of history of Germany and Italy at this time—but she was the chief participant in the conflict of the West and the East—i.e., the Crusades. The history of Spain during this epoch was that of a five centuries' warfare against the Mohammedan in the peninsula. English history in its constitutional aspects was throughout this period largely a thing apart from the main line of European development, although owing to the Norman Conquest, English political history became intimately related to that of feudal Europe.

These are the main facts of the history of Central and Western Europe between 814—the death of Charlemagne—and 1291—the end of the Crusades. But another history remains to be noticed, that of the Roman Empire of the East. Byzantine history was not German at all nor yet wholly Roman. Nevertheless it is very important.

It must not be forgotten that Constantinople was the immediate and direct heir of antiquity. Constantinople was a new Rome and was the repository of the civilization and culture, the learning and the art of the ancient world. Her material civilization was brilliant when London and Paris were obscure, squalid towns. She possessed libraries and museums in which had been garnered the lore of the Graeco-Roman world. Her government was great and strong when Western Europe was a chaos of jarring feudal groups. Much of our inheritance from ancient Greece we owe to its preservation by Constantinople. Moreover, for centuries Constantinople was the great bastion of Europe, protecting it from the Mohammedan East.

6. *Educational value of mediaeval history.*—The educational value of mediaeval history is very great. The culture and the civilization of Europe and America to-day are largely a heritage from the past. The enormous development in the nineteenth century of invention and the mechanical arts must not blind our eyes to the fact that the real roots of modern life go deep down into the Middle Ages and even beyond to Greece and Rome. Mechanical and material things are not institutions; they may condition living but they do not constitute life. Every nation of to-day in Europe traces its history for ages back. It finds in its very origins the proofs of its right to be and sees in its past history the promise and security of its future. It is literally true that the history of Europe and the Mohammedan Orient as it is to-day cannot be understood unless one knows the history, not only of their immediate, but of their remote past.

The greatest thinkers, not merely among historians but among philosophers and poets, have perceived the value and the unity of history—Goethe, Carlyle, Browning. "The Past's enormous disarray" is apparent, not real. In "Faust," Goethe has said:

What you the spirit of the ages call
Is nothing but the spirit of you all
Wherein the ages are reflected.

And Browning in "Fra Lippo Lippi" says:

This world's no blot to us,

No blank. . . .

To find its meaning is my meat and drink.

7. *Truth in mediaeval history.*—Perhaps there is no body of human knowledge that has been more overlaid with falsehood, more distorted from the truth, more perverted by sentiment, more wrenched by prejudice than mediaeval history, and none about which more credulous and erroneous beliefs obtain. In spite of the labors of accomplished scholars for nearly a century, since the rise of critical historical method, each succeeding generation perpetuates the errors of its predecessor. Every teacher of history knows how persistent and broadcast is the spread of false historical ideas. A considerable portion of the time of every teacher has to be spent in uprooting mistaken notions, and the discouraging feature is that generation after generation of college students come to their classes with these errors in their minds and the ground has to be cleared anew each year.

Modern scholarship has revolutionized the history of the persecution of Christianity by the Roman government and exploded the old idea as to the origin and use of the catacombs; it has revolutionized the interpretation of the history of the barbarian invasions; destroyed the legend of the burning of the Alexandrian Library by Omar and the legend of the terrors of the year 1000; stripped the romance from Richard Lion Heart's captivity; written the story of the Crusades in terms of history and not of fiction; made mediaeval history natural and human instead of being "dark" or sentimentally romantic. "Human affairs," said Richter, "are neither to be laughed at nor wept over, but to be understood." It were well for every student to bear this in mind.

8. *Point of view.*—In order to understand the history of the Middle Ages it is essential that the student free his mind of present-day conceptions and prejudiced interpretation—that he put himself as far as possible, by the exercise of historical imagination, into the time and place of the events about which he is reading.

9. *Termini and subdivisions.*—In section 5, above, the attempt was made to show that what is called the Middle Ages is only an intellectual convenience; that there is a unity of history which prevails over all dividing lines we may draw, or epochs we may distinguish; that all periodization is more or less arbitrary. With the understanding, then, that every period is one of transition and that every event must be related both to what preceded and what succeeded, it is convenient to distinguish certain dates of more than usual importance as milestones along the road of the past. For the early Middle Ages some of these dates are:

313, recognition of Christianity by Constantine.

378, battle of Adrianople.

395, division between the East and West.

Each of these dates may be taken as a starting-point, yet none is wholly satisfactory. The im-

portant fact to notice is that they all fall within the fourth century and that the fourth century is the century—the transitional century between the ancient world and the Middle Ages. Nevertheless the student must understand that these division points are more or less arbitrary.

If we are perplexed in the selection of an initial date for the Middle Ages, the difficulty is even greater in choosing a concluding date. The change from mediaeval to modern history is so subtle, so gradual, as to be almost imperceptible. To look for it is like watching for the dawn or the twilight. Nevertheless in spite of this element of doubt and uncertainty, and keeping in mind that all dates have significance only in proportion to the relevance attached to them, in the fifteenth century we encounter a combination of events which are climacteric, such as:

- 1453, capture of Constantinople by the Turks.
- 1453, end of the Hundred Years' War between England and France.
- 1492, expulsion of the Moors from Spain (observe how the map of Europe "evens up," for, as Mohammedanism is expelled in the West, it enters Europe in the East).
- 1492, discovery of America.
- 1494, French invasion of Italy.
- 1498, discovery of the southwest passage to India around the Cape of Good Hope, which revolutionized commerce and changed the front of Europe to the westward.

As to subdivisions of the broad stretch of time between the fourth century and the end of the fifteenth century, again there is great latitude. Lavissee and Rambaud (*Histoire générale*) distinguish three periods:

- 395-1095, from the division of the Roman Empire to the Crusades.
- 1095-1270, from the beginning of the Crusades to the death of St. Louis, "the last Crusader."
- 1270-1492, from the end of the Crusades to the discovery of America:

But one may quite as reasonably distinguish three periods as follows:

- 313-814, from the recognition of Christianity by Constantine to the death of Charlemagne.
- 814-1291, from the death of Charlemagne to the loss of Acre, the last Christian holding in the Holy Land.
- 1291- {
 - 1453. Capture of Constantinople by the Turks.
 - 1494. French invasion of Italy.
 - 1498. Discovery of the southwest passage to India.

The selection of any particular date will largely depend upon the interest and interpretation of the teacher. The unity and the complexity of history alike preclude the choice of any particular date to the exclusion of another which may be equally important.

Reports from the Historical Field

WALTER H. CUSHING, EDITOR.

NOTES.

The Louisiana Historical Society is preparing for the commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the Battle of New Orleans and the one hundred years of peace between Great Britain and the United States, which began with the end of that battle. The program for the exercises to be held January 8, 9, 10, 1915, includes a naval parade, the unveiling of a monument, an address by the President of the United States, a military parade and a historical pageant.

The recent meeting of the Kansas History Teachers' Association was attended by about 450 persons. The active membership in the Society is now about 100. The officers are: President, Prof. C. L. Becker, of the University of Kansas; vice-president, Prof. Arthur N. Hyde, of Washburn College; secretary-treasurer, Miss Mary A. Whitney, of the Kansas State Normal School, Emporium, Kansas.

The English Historical Association leaflet No. 36 contains a short bibliography upon the present war for the use of teachers of history. The bibliography is not so comprehensive as that which appeared in the HISTORY TEACHER'S MAGAZINE for November, but it does contain a number of references upon the art of war, poetry of the war and miscellaneous subjects. Copies may be obtained from the secretary, Miss M. B. Curran, 6 South Square, Gray's Inn, London, W. C.

The Iowa Society of Social Science Teachers, after considerable discussion, unanimously agreed that the organization should include the teachers of economics, government and sociology, as well as the teachers of history, and therefore the above name was adopted. The president of the Society for the coming year is Thomas Teakle, Professor of History in the North Des Moines High School, Des Moines, Iowa. All communications addressed to the Society of Social Science Teachers should be sent to Professor Teakle.

A committee of the Indiana State History Teacher's Section has sent out a questionnaire, requesting information and opinions upon the existing course of study in history in the high schools of the State.

Professor Frank M. Anderson, of Dartmouth College, will conduct a course on "The War" during the second half year. The discussion will be based upon a careful study of State documents, newspapers and magazine articles.

A meeting of the Council of the New England History Teachers' Association was held in Boston on Saturday, December 5. It was voted to hold the spring meeting of the association in Worcester, Mass., on Friday and Saturday, April 30 and May 1. The subject for discussion on Saturday, May 1, will be the "Teaching of Recent American History." A special committee on Definitions of the Fields of History was appointed, consisting of Professor George M. Dutcher, chairman; Mr. Archibald Freeman, of Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass., and Mr. Philip P. Chase, of Milton Academy. Plans for the Friday evening meeting have not yet been completed, but will undoubtedly comprise an address, followed by an informal reception. The following committee appointments were made: On Text-books, Professor Charles R. Lingley, of Dartmouth College, and Miss Nellie Hammond, of Woburn High School, were added. On Historical Material, Professor Arthur I. Andrews, of Tufts College, and Mr. Foster Stearns, of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston,

were added. On Historical Pictures, Mr. Roy W. Hatch, of the Somerville High School, was made chairman, and Miss Blanche Leavitt, of Newport, R. I., was added. Professor Hormel, of Bowdoin College, was added to the Committee on Membership. The Council voted to renew for the ensuing year the appropriation for the HISTORY TEACHER'S MAGAZINE on the same terms as have existed during the past three years. The next meeting of the Council will be held on Saturday, February 6, in Boston.

The Texas History Teacher's "Bulletin" for November, 1914, contains an article by Professor Frederic Duncalf, of the University of Texas, on "Some Reasons for Teaching Social and Economic History in the High School History Courses." Another article in this number of the "Bulletin" is an outline of the history course in the San Marcos High School, giving a detailed outline showing how the period of the French Revolution is treated by topics and references. Mr. F. B. Marsh, of the University of Texas, has an article on map work in Ancient History. Mr. J. B. Layne, of the Comanche High School, makes practical suggestions for the preparation for history teaching. The usual personal notes and book news articles complete the pamphlet.

Periodical Literature

BY MARY W. WILLIAMS, PH.D., EDITOR.

"Harper's Magazine" for December presents "Lincoln and Some Union Generals," from the hitherto unpublished diaries of John Hay, Lincoln's private secretary, compiled and edited by William Roscoe Thayer. The extracts throw interesting light upon Lincoln's attitude towards several Union military leaders.

"Man as a Geographical Agency" ("Geographical Journal," November), by Sir Charles P. Lucas, lately of the British Colonial Office, calls attention to the great changes wrought by man in the flora, fauna, climate and topography of the earth.

In an article entitled, "The Physical Emancipation of Porto Rico," in the "Review of Reviews" for December, Alton G. Grinnell describes the victorious campaign of the United States Government against hookworm among the Porto Ricans.

The most vital factor making for the strength of England, in the opinion of Professor Roland G. Usher, of Washington University, is her "spiritual national consciousness," which quality England possesses in a greater degree than any other nation in the world, because she led all in the attainment of territorial and racial unity. This idea appears in an article on "The Oldest Nation of Europe," published in the "National Geographic Magazine" for October.

"Practical Mediation and International Peace" ("North American Review," December), by Charles H. Sherrill, calls attention to the great importance of the A. B. C. mediation in connection with the difficulty between the United States and Mexico last spring. The two outstanding results of the efforts of the three Latin-American republics are (1) the establishment of a High Court of Public Opinion for the Western Hemisphere, which really amounts to the formulation of a peace plan for the New World; (2) the assumption by the South American states of a share in the responsibility and development of the Monroe Doctrine, and in consequence, a growth in friendliness and understanding between the states of the two Americas.

"Was the War of 1912 a Crusade?" Elizabeth Christich asks in the "Catholic World" for December; and she answers the question in the affirmative by presenting much evidence that a strong religious spirit dominated the Balkan States in their fight against the Turk, and by calling attention to the activity in building and restoring Christian churches which took place as soon as the war ended.

The "Nineteenth Century and After" for November contains the following articles relating to the war: "The Responsibility for the War: German and British Official Papers Compared," by R. S. Nolan; "The Ultimate Disappearance of Austria-Hungary," by J. Ellis Barker; "Belgium in War: a Record of Personal Experiences," by J. H. Whitehouse; "How Belgium Saved England," by D. C. Lathbury.

"France, 1914" ("Century," December), by Lester G. Hornby, is an artist's diary of the first days of the war in Brittany, Paris, and Havre, illustrated by the author in colors and in black and white. Because of the vividness with which it reflects the atmosphere and spirit of the period, the account possesses unusual interest.

The "North American Review" for December contains a study upon "The Neutrality of Belgium," by Professor A. G. Lapradelle, of the University of Paris. The author believes that, rather than divert the hopes of the pacifists from the organization of neutral states, the experience of Belgium should lead to the widening of the system by increasing the number of guarantors, and by enabling neutral states to uphold one another's neutrality.

"World's Work" for December is a "war manual," devoted largely to the effect of the European war upon the Americas. The table of contents includes the following articles: "An Invitation to Brazil," by Dominico Da Gama, Ambassador of Brazil to the United States; "Peru, a Rich Commercial Field," by Federico Alfonso Pezet, Minister of Peru to the United States; "Bolivia's Commercial Possibilities," by Ignacio Calderon, Minister of Bolivia to the United States; "Anglo-American Relations and the War," by Arthur Willert, Washington correspondent of the London "Times"; "The Ties That Bind America and Germany," by Bernhard Dernberg, formerly Secretary of State for the Colonies of the German Empire.

According to Bernhard Dernberg, Germany is "the only nation of Europe that, even in the face of intense provocation, has never let herself be dragged into any war, or has taken by force a foot of territory against the will of the owner." This remarkable statement occurs in the "Independent" for December 7, under the title, "When Germany Has Won." The peculiarly illogical, non-committal character of Mr. Dernberg's article makes it unique. After referring to the unrest in Lorraine and northern Schleswig, the writer states that any peace arrangement not following pretty closely definite national lines would result in friction. He adds, however, that this does not say that every single German is to be returned to Germany, or every Frenchman to France. The plan proposed for territorial settlement seems to bear little relation to the preliminary statements. It is also somewhat vague and indefinite, but appears to include the following points: Commercial union of Belgium with Germany; neutralization of all of the Channel ports; German colonies to be secured from "some such place like Morocco;" acquisition of German sphere of influence from the Persian Gulf to the Dardanelles; also, possibly, the restoration of Finland to Sweden, and Egypt to Turkey, and the independence of the Boers and the Russian Poles.

BOOK REVIEWS

EDITED BY PROFESSOR WAYLAND J. CHASE,
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN.

MACALISTER, R. A. S. *The Philistines: Their History and Civilization*. London: Oxford University Press, 1914. Pp. iv + 136. \$1.20.

This little book on the Philistines, whose opposition to the Hebrews has made their name to-day one of reproach, appears in the Schweich Lectures. As their purpose is to discuss the relation between modern thought and the Bible, one might fear an apologetic motive, but no opponent of the "Higher Criticism" will gain comfort from it, for the latest results of the historical criticism of the Old Testament are fully utilized.

Unfortunately, the first chapter is the least inviting. Even the professional student will manifest little enthusiasm over the meaning of the Philistine name or theories long since abandoned as to their origin, while he will hesitate over the dangerous game of equating proper names, for example, Carpathus with Caphtor. Philistine connection with the wondrous Cretan civilization awakens more interest, but a detailed study of Egyptian name lists can hardly be popular.

Readers who persevere to the second chapter reap their reward in the story of Wen Amon, the Egyptian who sailed to the north Philistine coast for cedar. His unconscious humor and the scrapes into which he gets himself have long made his narrative (see Breasted's "Records of Egypt"), an ideal source reading. Interpreted by Macalister in terms of the modern tourist, it becomes even funnier. He forgets his letters and suffers the troubles of a modern traveler without a passport. He interviews the Governor about his stolen valuables in person, as "there was no Egyptian consul at the time." Then, too, there is that grim little joke when the king would show Wen Amon the graves of the last ambassadors from Egypt, and the poor hero wails, "Oh, let me not see them!"

The study of the earlier relations between the Philistines and Hebrews is exceptionally good, and shows much independent thought. Macalister believes that the difficulties in the David and Goliath story are "evaded by an important group of the Greek MSS., which omit bodily" certain verses in this account. Their absence in our best authorities proves rather that they form a consistent story which was added later than the time of the Greek translation. The history after David is given very briefly, and can hardly be understood without a fuller background.

The chapter on "The Land of the Philistines" is devoted almost exclusively to the individual cities. Macalister modestly writes that the land "has been so often described that it is needless to waste space in an account of it." This is a cause of great regret, for throughout the book we have brief statements which show that our author knows the land and its effects on the people in a way no tourist can hope to equal.

The final chapter on culture is dominated by the discussion of the language, which in turn is dominated by the theory that the inscribed Cretan disc from Phaestus is Philistine, while even the invention of the alphabet is tentatively assigned to them! The study of the religion is good, if not novel, but we look in vain for an adequate summary of the results of those fruitful excavations on the borders of Philistia carried on by Macalister himself.

The book represents a type more common in England than America, which can be termed popular by clergymen and laymen interested in Bible problems, but forms rather

heavy reading to the average student of history. Nevertheless, it would be a great pity if this should prevent such a student from perusing the best history of the Philistines yet written.

A. T. OLMSTEAD.

The University of Missouri.

HULME, EDWARD MASLIN.—*The Renaissance, the Protestant Revolution, and the Catholic Reformation in Continental Europe*. New York: The Century Co. Pp. 589. \$2.50.

In the great libraries there is no lack of great works on such significant movements of European history as the Renaissance, the Protestant revolt, or the French revolution. But the difficulty has been that the scholarly works on such subjects have been found too detailed, too intensive for the average student and for the general reader. The popular books, on the other hand, are often too superficial to be strongly recommended. This book will, therefore, fill a real demand. It is not, as its title suggests, devoted solely to these three great movements. It is a history of Europe from about 1300 to about 1600. There is a chapter dealing even with "Magyar and Slav." Purely political history is merely sketched, but by a clever hand. The emphasis is properly laid on the great intellectual and religious movements, and the author's interpretation of them is excellent. His tone is broadly tolerant; he criticizes intolerance in both the Catholic and Protestant camps. He seems to have used much recent monographic literature in the preparation of his book. Occasionally a few pages are crammed with factual summaries, but as a whole the book is distinctly readable and interesting, notwithstanding the comparatively broad field which it covers. The reviewer believes it will prove very useful to students and teachers of history. Many parts of the book may be a little heavy, but others will be found very acceptable for reference readings.

CLARENCE PERKINS.

Ohio State University.

OGG, FREDERICK A. *Daniel Webster*. Philadelphia: George W. Jacobs & Co., 1914. Pp. 15 + 433. \$1.25.

This life of Webster is a welcome and notable addition to the admirable series known as the American Crisis Biographies. Professor Ogg has an interesting style, is very clear and direct in his statements, and holds steadfastly to his theme. The emphasis throughout is placed on Webster's interpretation of the constitution and the effect his views had in establishing a standard for the whole nation. So closely has the author held to this idea that the personality of Webster becomes at times somewhat obscured. However that may be, no one can read this biography without getting a clear conception of Webster as the great leader in establishing for the country as a whole a broad view of the proper functions of the national government.

One realizes the difficulties attending the writing of a brief account of the activities of a man like Webster. If all his important exploits are to be recorded, a brief account can be little more than a summary. The author has succeeded in avoiding this, for the most part, though in places it would seem that some events might have been left out to give more room for detailed accounts of more important affairs. The accounts of Webster's work against "Nullification," and his negotiations of the Webster-Ashburton Treaty, are perhaps the most spirited in the book, and the work of Webster in combating the financial policy of Van Buren, the least satisfactory. The view accepted by

most scholars, that Webster did not make the 7th of March speech as a bid for the Presidency, is taken by Professor Ogg and very clearly set forth.

Webster's faults and weaknesses are touched lightly, but enough to show some of the reasons why the people did not put entire confidence in him, which, with his tendency to disregard party affiliations and party discipline, as shown in the biography, make it evident enough that he never could have been the President of the United States.

Professor Ogg's account of Webster as an orator and the occasions when he appeared at his best are sufficiently interesting and attractive to make anyone desire to read the orations at once and see for himself how such effects could be wrought.

The book is readable and interesting throughout. It will be well received by high school seniors in connection with their work in American history, and will be of interest to the general reader. It will not replace Lodge's life of Webster, however, but may be a pleasing variation to it. Professor Ogg gives more events, more quotations from Webster, gives less of his own opinions, judges Webster less freely and comments less sweepingly on the effect of Webster's work. He also gives his references. Senator Lodge, in taking up fewer topics, discusses them more freely, holds Webster up for judgment with less hesitation, gives no references and very few quotations.

CARL E. PRAY.

Michigan State Normal College, Ypsilanti, Mich.

HAYNES, JOHN. *Economics in the Secondary School*. Boston: The Houghton Mifflin Co., 1914. Pp. xi + 192. 60 cents.

Mr. Haynes' monograph is both an appeal and an argument for the teaching of economics in the public schools. Economy, industry, sympathy and adaptation to environment justify the claim of economics as an ethical subject, while the laborer, the employer, the legislator and the citizen justify its claims as a vocational subject. The great problems of the day are economic, and citizenship is more closely related to economics than to civics. The secondary school furnishes the last chance to teach the subject to any considerable number of students.

The argument of the author is brief, but to the point. The suitability of economics as a secondary school subject is recognized by leading educators. A questionnaire brought in considerable proof of progress in the teaching of economics in the schools. "From all the evidence we may be entirely satisfied that whenever the importance of economics receives recognition, and there is as much insistence on having an adequate time allotment and qualified teachers as in mathematics, language or science, the objection that the secondary school pupils cannot master its fundamental principles, will vanish."

A place for economics in the curriculum should be found during the last half of the senior year, because of the nature of the subject and the sequence of the history courses. This will necessitate some violence to the "four blocks" of history, namely, the teaching of only three blocks, and the reserving the place of the other for civics and economics. The author advocates the division of European history into two parts; the first, ancient; the second, modern history, allowing each to occupy one year. He would reserve the third year for American history, and the fourth for civics and economics. As we see, this is not a curtailment but an extensification of the history content. A very large number of history teachers would agree to this plan.

Mr. Haynes would not sacrifice the scientific nature of economics that it may be taught in the high schools. There is no attempt to unduly popularize basic economic

content. The outlines submitted, and his discussion make this clear. There is no attempt to convert the recitation into a committee of the whole for the discussion of town views, nor to make the subject matter carry the load of industrial history, sociology and government.

STEPHEN IVAN MILLER, JR.

Leland Stanford, Jr., University, California.

ADAMS, JOHN QUINCY. *Writings of*. Edited by W. C. Ford. Vol. IV, 1811-1813. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1914. Pp. xxv + 541. \$3.50.

These years, though marking the climax of the Napoleonic struggle in Europe, were probably the duller in Adams' career. With the object of his Russian mission for the most part accomplished, and with the Ghent negotiation only slowly taking form, he lived in St. Petersburg, on the edge of great events, with few close associates. He was not remarkably well informed as to current happenings, and his guesses as to the next turn were for the most part wrong. It would seem that the editor has devoted too much space to this period as compared with that given to the years up to 1811.

The main interest for the student of American history continues to be in the material on our commerce, and incidentally that of other nations. Of minor interest are letters concerning Fulton's application for privileges of steam navigation in Russia (pp. 402, 405, 409, 540). Adams' rejection of his election to the Supreme Court had been foreshadowed by a letter to his brother (p. 48), in which, with his usual just self-consciousness, he had written: "I am also, and always shall be, too much of a political partizan for a judge. . . ."

Adams' view as to the importance of conscription as the basis of French power are of present interest (pp. 325, 485). Letters to his mother give some pictures of life at St. Petersburg, drawn with all the minuteness of Arnold Bennett, while a letter to his brother and son reveal much sound sense on the subject of education. A certain, almost good humor, characterizes some of them (p. 44).

The editor still fails to help the reader on those few occasions when Adams' pen plays him false (i.e., p. 27, line 1, for "I," read "It").

CARL RUSSELL FISH.

The University of Wisconsin.

OFFENHEIMER, FRANZ. *The State: Its History and Development Viewed Sociologically*. Translated by John N. Gitterman. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1914. Pp. v, 302.

This work, by a Berlin privat-docent, appeared in 1903, has since been issued in Hungarian, French and English, and is now being translated into Roumanian and Italian. It "regards the State from the sociological standpoint only, not from the juristic," says the author—"sociology, as I understand the word, being both a philosophy of history and a theory of economics." The author assumes a fair knowledge of history in the mind of the reader, and proceeds in this very small book to trace the development of the State from its earliest appearance to the present constitutional systems. The translator's style is easy and agreeable. No great mass of details is introduced, but the reasoning is close and demands the attention of a thoughtful mind. A perusal of the work will certainly repay the effort of the teacher of history who is of a philosophical turn. If he fears "socialism," whatever that may mean, he should avoid it, because it does tend to leave the impression that some rather firmly planted institutions are neither divinely inspired nor necessary.

Hunter College, New York City

EDGAR DAWSON.

LOUISIANA HIGH SCHOOL RALLY DAY.

(Continued from page 19.)

tion, "Mention the leading authors of Louisiana and state in what line of literature each was noted," included all the text-books written by various members of the faculty of the State University.

The prizes this time (as each school could send only one contestant) were gold, sterling and oxidized medals for the first, second and third places, respectively. The schools had selected their representatives by preliminary competitive examinations.

It is the intention of the History Department to continue the contest along this line until every phase of history taught in the Louisiana high schools shall have been covered, in order to stimulate both teachers and pupils to a greater interest and a more thorough knowledge. When the four years' work has been covered, some other plan will be devised.

This rally was inaugurated about seven years ago, and is conducted by a committee of the faculty, under the efficient direction of Professor Charles H. Stumberg, of the department of German. One of the deans has observed that since the rally was inaugurated, the ability and preparation of the average freshman has materially improved. Of course, he does not attribute that result entirely to the influence of the rally, but it has undoubtedly been one of the most important factors in this change.

The History Teacher's Magazine

Published monthly, except July and August,
at 1619-1621 Ranstead Street, Philadelphia, Pa., by
McKINLEY PUBLISHING CO.

EDITED UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF A COMMITTEE
OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION,
composed of:

PROF. HENRY JOHNSON, Teachers College, Columbia University, Chairman.

PROF. FRED. M. FLING, University of Nebraska.

PROF. BLANCHE E. HAZARD, Cornell University.

PROF. GEORGE C. SELLERY, University of Wisconsin.

PROF. ST. GEORGE L. SIOUSSAT, Vanderbilt University.

DR. JAMES SULLIVAN, Boys' High School, Brooklyn, N. Y.

ALBERT E. McKINLEY, Ph.D., Managing Editor

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, two dollars a year; single copies, twenty cents each.

REDUCED RATE of one dollar a year is granted to members of the American Historical Association, and to members of local and regional associations of history teachers. Such subscriptions must be sent direct to the publishers or through the secretaries of associations (but not through subscription agencies).

POSTAGE PREPAID in United States and Mexico; for Canada, twenty cents additional should be added to the subscription price, and for other foreign countries in the Postal Union, thirty cents additional.

CHANGE OF ADDRESS. Both the old and the new address must be given when a change of address is ordered.

ADVERTISING RATES furnished upon application.

BOOKS ON HISTORY AND GOVERNMENT PUBLISHED IN THE UNITED STATES FROM OCTOBER 31 TO NOVEMBER 28, 1914.

LISTED BY CHARLES A. COULOMB, PH.D.

American History.

- Atherton, Gertrude F. H. California: an intimate history. N. Y.: Harper. 329 pp. \$2.00 net.
- Cambridge, Mass. Historical facts; an outline of the salient events in the history of Cambridge, Mass. Boston: Newtowne Pub. Co. 16 pp. 10 cents.
- Dickson, Marguerite S. New American history for grammar schools. N. Y.: Macmillan. 560 pp. \$1.00 net.
- Fleming, Walter L. Civil war and reconstruction in Alabama. Cleveland, O.: A. H. Clark Co. 838 pp. \$5.00 net.
- Hunt, Gaillard. Life in America one hundred years ago. N. Y.: Harper. 297 pp. (8 pp. bibl.). \$1.50 net.
- Indiana State Teachers' Assn. Com. of History Section. Compiler and editor. Readings in Indiana history. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana Univ. 470 pp. 70 cents.
- Love, William D. The colonial history of Hartford. Hartford, Ct.: The author. 369 pp. \$5.00.
- McElroy, Robt. M. The winning of the far West. . . 1829-1867. N. Y.: Putnam. 384 pp. \$2.50 net.
- Nead, Dan. W. The Pennsylvania-German in the settlement of Maryland. Pt. XXV of a narrative and critical history. Lancaster, Pa.: [New Era Pr. Co.]. (3 pp. bibl.). \$5.00.
- Sanford, Albert H. A teacher's manual to accompany the Sanford Am. History maps. Chicago: A. J. Nystrom & Co. 95 pp. 25 cents.
- Stevenson, Edward L. Willem Janszoon Blaeuw, 1571-1638, . . . with special reference to his large world map of 1605. N. Y.: Hispanic Soc. of Am. 67 pp. \$12.00 net.
- Virginia State Library. Maps relating to Virginia in the library and other depts. of the Commonwealth with the 17th and 18th century atlas maps in the Library of Congress. Richmond, Va.: [The Library]. 262 pp. (Bulletin.)
- Weber, Anselm. The Navajo Indians. [St. Michaels, Arizona. The author.] 29 pp. Privately printed.
- Weeks, Stephen B. Historical review of the Colonial and State records of North Carolina. Wash., D. C.: The author. 409 B St., N. E. 176 pp. \$1.25 net.

Ancient History.

- Geikie, James. The antiquity of man in Europe. N. Y.: Van Nostrand. 328 pp. \$3.00 net.

English History.

- Hill, S. C. Yusuf Khan, the rebel commandant. [In re wars between English and French for southern India.] N. Y.: Longmans. 320 pp. (3½ pp. bibl.). \$3.50 net.
- Innes, Arthur D. History of England and the British Empire. In 4 vols. Library ed. Vol. 2, 1485-1688; Vol. 3, 1689-1802. N. Y.: Macmillan. Each \$3.25 net.
- Levis, Howard C. Baziliwlogia, a book of Kings; notes on a rare series of engraved English royal portraits from William the Conqueror to James I, published under the above title in 1618. N. Y.: Grolier Club. (5 pp. bibl.). \$10.00. To members only.
- Macaulay, Thomas B. Lord. The history of England, etc. In 6 vols. Vol. 4. N. Y.: Macmillan. 549 pp. \$3.25 net.
- Scholefield, E. O. S., and Howay, F. W. British Columbia from the earliest times to the present. In 4 vols. Chicago: S. J. Clarke Co. \$30.00.

European History.

- Breasted, James H., and Robinson, J. H. Outlines of European History. In 2 vols. Vol. 1, Earliest man, the Orient, Greece, Rome, by J. H. Breasted; Europe from the breakup of the Roman Empire to the opening of the eighteenth century, by J. H. Robinson. Boston: Ginn & Co. 730 pp. (13 2-3 pp. bibl.). \$1.50.

- Cramb, J. A. Germany and England. N. Y.: Dutton. 152 pp. \$1.00 net.
- Fisher, Herbert A. L. The war, its causes and issues. N. Y.: Longmans. 31 pp. 20 cents.
- Hart, Albert Bushnell. The war in Europe, its causes and results. N. Y.: Appleton. 254 pp. \$1.00 net.
- Kilpatrick, James A., compiler and ed. Tommy Atkins at war; as told in his own letters. N. Y.: McBride, Nast. 127 pp. 50 cents.
- Oxford University Press. Pamphlets on the present war in Europe by various authors. Twenty-six issued to date. Each, 3 to 10 cents. N. Y.: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Sadler, Michael E. Modern Germany and the Modern World. N. Y.: Macmillan. 14 pp. 10 cents net.
- Stoddard, T. Lothrop. The French Revolution in San Domingo. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin. 410 pp. (15 pp. bibl.). \$2.00 net.

Miscellaneous.

- Bancroft, Herbert H. History of Mexico. N. Y.: Bancroft Co. [156 Fifth Ave.]. 581 pp. \$2.00 net.
- Bartholomew, John G. The international reference atlas of the world. N. Y.: Scribner. 120 + 69 pp. \$4.20 net.
- Coss, John J., and Erskine, J. A pageant of the thirteenth century; for the 700th anniversary of Roger Bacon, given by Columbia University. N. Y.: Lemecke & Beucher. 75 pp.
- Edmunds, Albert J. History simplified. Phila.: Innes and Sons. 70 pp. 25 cents.
- Getty, Alice. The gods of Northern Buddhism. N. Y.: Oxford Univ. 196 pp. (3 pp. bibl.). \$19.25 net.
- Mulowney, John J. A revelation of the Chinese revolution. N. Y. and Chicago: Revell. 142 pp. 75 cents net.
- "Red papers" of Mexico; an expose of the great Cientifico conspiracy to eliminate . . . Carranza. N. Y.: Mex. Bureau of Inf., 334 Whitehall Bldg. 15 pp.

Biography.

- Adams, John Quincy. The writings of J. Q. Adams. Ed. by Worthington C. Ford. Vol. 4, 1811-1813. N. Y.: Macmillan. 541 pp. \$3.50 net.
- Dodd, Ephraim S. Diary of Ephraim S. Dodd. [Co. D., Texas Rangers.] 1862-1864. Austin, Tex.: Tex. State Library. 32 pp.
- Steiner, Bernard C. Life of Reverdy Johnson. Balto.: Norman, Remington Co. 284 pp. \$2.50.
- Johnson, Byron B. Abraham Lincoln and Boston Corbett. Waltham, Mass.: [The author]. 71 pp. \$1.00.
- Marshall, John. The political and economic doctrines of John Marshall . . . and also his letters, speeches [etc.]. N. Y.: Neale Pub. Co. 369 pp. (13 pp. bibl.). \$3.00.
- Hudson, William H. The man Napoleon. N. Y.: Crowell. 242 pp. \$1.50 net.
- Whipple, Wayne, compiler and ed. The story-life of Napoleon. N. Y.: Century Co. 606 pp. (5 pp. bibl.). \$2.40 net.
- Parnell, John H. Charles Stewart Parnell; a memoir by his brother. N. Y.: Holt. 312 pp. \$3.00 net.
- Hill, Frederick T. Washington, the man of action. N. Y.: Appleton. 329 pp. \$5.00 net.
- Washington, George. Washington and the West; being George Washington's diary of September, 1784 [etc.]. Cleveland, O.: A. H. Clark Co. 217 pp. \$2.00 net.

Government and Politics.

- Chase, Edith F. The Bohemians. N. Y. and Chicago: Revell. 63 pp. 25 cents net.
- Cromer, Evelyn Baring, Lord. Political and literary essays. 2d series. N. Y.: Macmillan. 362 pp. \$2.00 net.
- Davis, Horace A. The Judicial veto. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin. 148 pp. (6 pp. bibl.). \$1.00 net.
- Matthews, Nathan, Jr. Municipal charters; a discussion of the essentials of a city charter. Cambridge, Mass.: Harv. Univ. 210 pp. \$2.00 net.

Sanford's New Series of American History Maps

SENT ON APPROVAL!

READ WHAT USERS SAY OF THEM

AT FIRST SKEPTICAL—NOW CONVINCED

I want to tell you how pleased I am with the Sanford History Maps. It is safe to say that there is no one set of maps anywhere that will be found as helpful to the teacher and to the student as this series.

I was rather skeptical as to the value of such a chart in history teaching in the high school, but I find myself using it constantly. It is a ready source of information, it expresses concretely many things that would take long to explain; it affords a basis for map work. The maps on the development of the West, the growth of population, immigration, railways, etc., are especially useful.

I think that no school history room is complete without this series.

P. M. MELCHOIR,

Head, History Dept., Girard College, Philadelphia, Pa.

I CONSIDER THEM THE BEST

After a very careful examination and a thorough test in our history classes here I have recommended the purchase of the Sanford American History Maps. I do not hesitate to say that I consider them the best maps on the market for the teaching of American history. You are at liberty to quote my opinion, as I think aids of this kind should be found in every school history room.

Yours very truly,

O. M. DICKERSON,

Head, History Dept., State Normal School, Winona, Minn.

VERY SATISFACTORY INDEED

Thank you very kindly for submitting the Sanford U. S. History Maps to me.

I have examined all of them carefully, find them very satisfactory indeed, and shall seek to add as many of them as possible to our equipment.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT A. MAURER,
Head, Dept. of History,
Washington, D. C.,
High Schools.

H. T. M.

1-15

A. J. NYSTROM
& CO.

623 S. Wabash Ave.
Chicago, Ill.

GENTLEMEN:

You may ship on approval a complete set of 32 Sanford American History Maps with Teacher's Manual and tripod supporter. If satisfactory we shall keep and pay \$24.00 for same. If unsatisfactory we shall return at your expense.

A. J. NYSTROM & CO., Publishers

U. S. Agents for W. & A. K. JOHNSTON'S MAPS, GLOBES, CHARTS and ATLASES
623-629 S. Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

FILL IN, CUT OR TEAR OUT, AND MAIL TO-DAY

Individual

Official Position

Institution

Date

c

